

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1880.

- ART. I. 1.—*Conversations in Paris from 1848 to 1852 with M. Thiers, M. Guizot, and others.* By W. NASSAU SENIOR. Two Vols. Hurst and Blackett. 1871.
2. *Conversations with M. Thiers, M. Guizot, and other Distinguished Persons during the Second Empire.* By the late W. NASSAU SENIOR. Edited by his Daughter, M. C. M. SIMPSON. Two Vols. Hurst and Blackett. 1878.
3. *Conversations with Distinguished Persons during the Second Empire from 1860 to 1863.* By the late W. NASSAU SENIOR, Master in Chancery, Professor of Political Economy, Membre Correspondant de l'Institut de France, &c., &c. Edited by his Daughter, M. C. M. SIMPSON. Two Vols. Hurst and Blackett. 1880.
4. *Journals kept in Ireland during the Years 1846-7.* By WILLIAM NASSAU SENIOR, Professor of Political Economy, &c., &c. Longmans. 1856.

WHEN a man of sound judgment and much experience has exceptional opportunities of gauging the views of distinguished foreigners, and when those foreigners obligingly turn themselves inside out for his behoof; when, moreover, this man makes it a point to put down carefully every word spoken on both sides during his conversations, the result cannot fail to be both valuable and interesting.

Mr. Nassau Senior had the *entrée* of the first French society. He was the personal friend of Thiers and Guizot, and many other of the foremost men who stood aloof from Louis Napoleon. Montalembert would correct for publi-

cation a speech which Senior had taken down in the Chamber; Thiers would add, in his own hand, an explanatory note to the record of one of their conversations. But, though his friends lay mainly among the Opposition, he saw a good deal of the other side—Prince Napoleon, for instance, and Lord Cowley, whose personal friendship for the Emperor made many Frenchmen very sore, because it seemed to be combined with distrust of them as a nation. He was in a position to judge impartially; and, though his own bias was strong, we may be sure it never led him to warp the truth.

We shall devote most space to the two new volumes, partly because the others have doubtless been in the hands of many of our readers, and partly because these deal most exclusively with what we take to be Senior's chief work: to show what the mind of France really thought of that remarkable Government—remarkable in so many ways—which came to an end at Sedan.

But even these last volumes are not limited to this. We have plenty about French character from a Frenchman's point of view; we have Barrot (who agrees with Mr. Senior in preferring Said Pacha's rule to that of the Emperor) explaining at great length how Lamartine's obstinate vanity ruined the monarchy by preventing the regency of the Duchess of Orleans; we have Duvergier pointing out how the Empire was the work of the extreme Left, who thought that if Louis Napoleon overturned the Constitution they could easily overturn him and set up a red Republic; we have the speakers all agreeing that, if Italy is united, France must have compensation, and that it had better be on the Rhine. We have, too, something in the latest volumes, and a good deal more in those which preceded them, about the Revolution of 1830. In fact, to any one who wishes to understand the last fifty years of French history, the characters and feelings of the actors, and the secret springs of action, all the volumes are invaluable. Imaginary conversations are always open to the charge that the writer, like the showman in Punch, provides not only the words on both sides, but the thoughts. Here we have the *ipsissima verba* of men who were actively engaged in the matters which they discussed, and whose position and influence gave them a right to be accepted as authorities.

Mr. Senior does not attempt to play Boswell to those

with whom he conversed ; he does not analyse their minds or discuss their motives, but simply leaves them to make the best of their own case. Nor, except in the case of the long talks with Thiers, which fill a large part of the earlier volumes, is there anything like sequence. Thiers had a way of taking up a conversation where it had been dropped—of making his talk, *i.e.*, even more like a book than is the case with Frenchmen in general. The other speakers just deal with the topic of the day : and the result is a medley which, in spite of the full table of contents, is sometimes a little vexatious to the reader, who wants the help of an index, and would gladly sacrifice some of the freshness of the work for a little arrangement.

Of all the famous men who appear in these volumes Thiers is on the whole the most remarkable* and the most typically French. He draws his own portrait as the testy little Republican who said of himself: "I am naturally absolute. It is with difficulty I can tolerate the opposition of my colleagues ; but of all things, that which I can least support is the dictation of a mob." How he showed this in his outrageous proclamations during the Commune, when he placarded every village with abuse of those *bêtes fauves*, those cowardly monsters in human form, as he called the Communards. If all that these Frenchmen say of themselves were as true as that, we should have here the truest set of portraits ever given to the world. "The corner-stone of my policy," says Thiers, "has always been the English alliance ;" and then he goes on to show why he valued it—"because, allied to England, we might in a month be in Berlin and Vienna." As Senior reminds him, he nearly sacrificed it in 1840 on the Egyptian question.

Again : "I have sacrificed my whole life to the English alliance. I always believed that the civilisation of Europe depends on it. If it had existed in 1848, the Continent would not have endured one year of anarchy to be succeeded by many of despotism. . . . My veracity ought not to be doubted, for I have sacrificed to this alliance the two great objects of public life—power and popularity. I have seen it destroyed by men whom, with all their faults, I admired and liked—Louis Philippe and Palmerston. I

* In the first series on our list he is H, Guizot being Z, Miss Simpson's rule being to give letters instead of names when people are yet living.

have seen it re-established by a man whom I hate and despise."

Thiers' temper was irrepressible; Louis Philippe sent for him on February 24th, 1848, when his throne was tottering to its fall, and even at such a moment the little man could not control himself. Louis Philippe calmed him by letting him have everything his own way: "Whatever is arranged you must be chief; you are the only one of the set that I can trust." "That suits me," replied Thiers, "for I have resolved never again to enter a Cabinet of which I am not the head."

The new Cabinet, we know, was stillborn. No change at the last could overcome the bourgeoisie's distrust of the King, whom they looked on as not only *fin et rusé* but *fourbe*; nor did Bugeaud have what he longed for: *le plaisir de tuer beaucoup de cette canaille*. Thiers, who was several times under fire during this eventful day, showed himself a cleverer manager than Bugeaud. The latter had sent a regiment of Chasseurs de Vincennes for ammunition. "Nonsense," cried Thiers, "you've deprived us of one of our best regiments, and in three hours regiment and ammunition will be in the insurgents' hands. You should have sent artillerymen disguised as peasants in boats full of wood or stones, and in two hours you might have had the ammunition in the Louvre." Bugeaud, in fact, though he was called "the first general in Europe," lost his head. The feeling that he was the most unpopular man in Paris—more so even than Prime Minister Guizot—may have unnerved him. His troops fraternised almost *en masse* with the people.

Thiers was just as unceremonious by-and-by with Louis Napoleon as he had been with the Orleans family. When the Pretender brought him the address which he had published while canvassing for the Presidentship, Thiers told him it was detestable, full of socialism and bad French, and sent him away to try and write a new one.

"The English," said Thiers, during one of the few desultory conversations, which are the pleasantest of any, "are the only people I respect; the Italians the only people I love." And then he goes on to attack primogeniture: "Not for all your wealth and all your civilisation would I submit to it. It makes half your gentlemen exiles, half your ladies old maids. It forces you to make slaves of a hundred million Hindoos to enable an

English younger son to consume the revenue which would have fed fifty native families, and to bring back a proconsular fortune." Here he is (as often happens to him) delightfully beside the mark. "India," Senior reminds him, "is the appanage of the bourgeoisie, who are quite unstained by the vice of primogeniture." But Thiers, unbaffled, goes on to contrast the poverty of English art collections with the art riches of Paris, especially the engravings in the Louvre. "With all your wealth, and all your intelligence, and all your efforts, you have not yet succeeded in becoming eminent in art as inventors, or even as possessors;" and then he begins to glorify France as uncompromisingly as if he was Victor Hugo himself, putting the French cathedrals at the head of Gothic architecture, extolling the façade of the Louvre above the great temple of Paestum, setting Racine above Homer and Virgil, "whom he most resembles, in short, above all I know—your Shakespeare, whom I read only in translations, I cannot compare him with." This is worth quoting, it is so characteristic: "What a nation is France! How mistaken in her objects, how absurd in her means, yet how glorious is the result of her influence and her example! I do not say that we are a happy people; I do not say that we are good neighbours, but after all we are the salt of the earth. . . . Two or three thousand years hence, when civilisation has passed on its westward course, and Europe is in the state we now see Asia Minor, and Syria, and Egypt, only two of her children will be remembered—one a sober, well-disposed, good boy, the other a riotous, unmanageable, spoilt child; and I am not sure that posterity will not like the naughty boy best." Better still is Thiers' picture of himself. His love of centralisation, his independence of control, come out on every page. He could not bear (he says) to be an English Minister; the subordinates are so independent, there are so many local privileges and local authorities. He thinks it grand that every throb of the heart of Paris should be felt in the Pyrenees and on the Rhine. He had a perfect mania for doing everything himself, his dictum being that Bonaparte nearly lost Marengo because he believed the assurance of three generals that they had carefully examined the Bormida, and that there was no bridge over it. It turned out there were two. Here is a picture of his official life: "When I was preparing for war in 1840 I sat every day for eight

hours with the Ministers of War, of Marine, and of the Interior. I always began by ascertaining the state of execution of our previous determinations. I never trusted to any assurances." (Men, he held, were naturally *menteurs, lâches, paresseux*.) "If I was told that letters had been sent, I required a certificate from the clerk who had posted or given them to the courier. If answers had been received, I required their production. I punished every negligence—even every delay. I kept my colleagues and clerks at work all day, and almost all night. We were all of us half killed, more with tension of mind than with bodily work. At night my servants undressed me, took me by the feet and shoulders, and placed me in bed, and I lay there like a corpse till morning. Even my dreams, when I dreamt, were administrative. Besides an iron will and an iron body, this needed indifference to the likes and dislikes of those about me. The sailors at Toulon did not know it was owing to me that their ships were well stored and victualled." Thiers was proud of the impulse which he said he had given to the naval and military administration,* and prophesied that "when the day of trial comes you will find your aristocratic first and second lords, and your gentlemanlike clerks who come at ten and go at four, as incapable of coping with our trained official hierarchy as your Militia would be with our Chasseurs de Vincennes." When Senior hinted that it must have been a remarkable education which gave Thiers this force of will and energy of character, he replied that most Frenchmen of his age had had the same. His father's trade, and the law business of his mother's family, were ruined by the Revolution. At his father's death he got into a Government school, the hardships of which, instead of killing the delicate lad, gave him in two years an iron constitution.

Thiers in 1853 prophesied that even in his lifetime the partition of Turkey would come, that Russia would be mistress of the Black Sea as well as the Baltic, and that then France and England would sink into second-rate powers. So much for the acumen of the first French statesman of modern times, who looked forward to the day

* Lord Hardinge wrote to Senior: "As a military man, I consider Thiers has more administrative power and knowledge of what is required for an army in the field than any other man in Europe. Had he been in power we should have had the French battering train at Varna; fourteen days ago it had not left Toulon."

when even fashion would fly after power, "not to the Thames, but to the Neva." The prospect of the Crimean war delighted a man who thought France was fallen into a lethargy, and contrasted Frenchmen's modern over-dread of bloodshed with the callousness of the first Napoleon and the brutality of men like Berthier, who thought men were made to be killed. Thiers' only objection to a war for establishing an Italian kingdom as a bar against Austria, and another to the south of the Danube as a bar against Russia, was that, "except Vaillant, the first engineer in Europe, *celui-ci* has not one man whom I would employ as a clerk."

He often reverts to the contrasts between French centralisation and English local government.* The latter he has always found means jobbery; in France, too, it is impossible, because France, in the midst of hostile neighbours, must have a master who is instantaneously felt at the extremities. How could the conscription be worked if local interests had to be taken into consideration? "But (asks Senior) can centralisation go along with a representative government?" "It is not easy (was the reply) to govern constitutionally a centralised country; but I will not yet admit it to be impossible."

Of Guizot, the stern Huguenot, whose patriarchal life—three generations under one roof—is well described, the portrait is no less complete. We can only find space to note his view of the Crimean war, so different from that of Thiers. He thought it was undertaken in the interest of England, for which he had far less fondness than his rival. "A war with Russia was probably inevitable; but it has come too soon. It is not a war to be undertaken during a famine by a nation divided into hostile factions, and governed by a usurper, who, by suppressing public opinion, has deprived himself of the help of public enthusiasm, whose councils no statesman of high character will enter, and whose armies our best soldiers refuse to command." And then Guizot tells how, when the Emperor sent an aide-de-camp to Bedeau, offering commands to him, Lamoricière, and Changarnier, Bedeau answered in the name of all: "If France was struggling for her own

* "Your ruling powers have always been local; with us they have long been cut off from local feelings—the army and the *hommes de lettres*. Who have governed France during the last ten years? Two '*hommes de lettres* qui n'avaient pas le sou.'"

interests we would readily serve as privates ; but we will accept no commands from you, especially in such a war as this." Guizot, nevertheless, believed the Emperor was really a Bonaparte : " his command of temper, his mastery of the *charlatanerie* which carries away the French people, he inherits from his uncle. His manner is exceedingly good, simple, mild, and gentlemanlike ; the worst part of it is the false expression of his eye." Guizot was persuaded that, if the Emperor lived, he would attempt a large extension of the French frontier. Speaking of his own book on the English Commonwealth, he lauded Cromwell's foreign policy : " He found England's foreign relations deplorable, he left them in an admirable position. There is nothing of the parvenu in his correspondence, no autograph letters, no irritating proclamations." Of course the reference here is to the habitual conduct of the Emperor, who, every one said, ought to have been less ready with words until he was in something like a state of preparation. We get behind the scenes and learn how it is that the French and English fleets did next to nothing in the Baltic. " Ducos, a mere nobody, who had risen by the intrepidity of his flattery, had promised us ten sail of the line ; he had assured the Emperor they were ready, and when the time came he had not one ship in sailing order. He begged us to put off the expedition for two months ; and, on our refusal, hurried his ships off with raw incomplete crews in such a condition that it is no wonder scarcely anything was attempted." Thiers was of course sarcastic at such a contrast to the completeness with which he looked into every detail of every department : " This was (he said) insisting on being his own Prime Minister, and yet he takes the word of men like Ducos for everything."

It is curious that, in 1852, Campan, editor of the *Gironde*, who had just been, without a word of explanation, ordered to Brussels, prophesied mischief to France if she rushed into aggressive war : " Our fate is to be partitioned, or at least diminished ; the nephew is not destined to succeed where the uncle failed. The rest of Europe has grown much faster than France has." The appearance of prosperity in that Paris which was in a ferment of pulling down and rebuilding, and where the *nouveaux riches* were rearing palaces as sumptuous as fairy dreams, Rivet and others distrusted. The Duc de Broglie remarked that, except railways, nothing was done which could not be

completed in a year or two. "Men build houses, which will be saleable in a year, but they don't drain, or reclaim, or plant woods *seris factura nepotibus umbram*; for they fear that fifty years hence grandchildren and forests may both be wanting." France, thought the Duke, can support seventy-two million people quite as easily as England can her eighteen millions; "our undeveloped resources are enormous."

Interesting, instructive, but a little monotonous is the talk of these anti-Bonapartists. Lanjuinais prophesies the speedy assassination of the Emperor; Dumon groans over the coarse luxury and expensive living; Dussard lamenting, as he points out the tall chimneys beginning to fringe the Seine, that even the clear air of Paris will be lost; Dunoyer asserting that all the revolutions in France have been nothing but struggles for public employment: "our Government has more than 300,000 places to give away in the Civil Service, yours has perhaps 10,000;" Villemain (whom the very eclectic Cousin classed among the four masters of style, the others being Tocqueville, G. Sand, and himself) regretting that the French are no longer a reading people, and that French books, unread at home, were sold mostly in Russia and Belgium; Montalembert admitting that Eastern France, which suffered most in the old war, was nevertheless the stronghold of Napoleonism.*

Sometimes there is a good deal of natural irritation at our rather too pronounced regard for the Emperor: "In 1852 he was a mixture of Danton and Domitian; now, in 1854, he is something greater than Cromwell. Your moral estimates depend on your interests." Still, the general feeling among Senior's associates is favourable to England. Thus Circourt says, in answer to the question, "Do you, like Sydney Smith, think our mission is to make calico?" "England's missions have been many, to introduce into the world representative government and free trade, and to keep alive the embers of European liberty. But your great mission is that foretold by Shakespeare, to found empires, to scatter wide the civilised man. Fifty years hence three or four hundred millions of the most energetic men in the world will speak English. French and German will be dialects, as Dutch and Portuguese are now." France has

* When he was canvassing there a peasant said: "Comment vent-on que je ne vote pas pour le monsieur, moi qui ai eu le nez gelé à Moscou?" "Et quand," added his wife, "nous avons eu deux fois, la maison pallée?"

one merit, that of having in 1789 made the hitherto religious and philosophical doctrine of the natural equality of man a principle of political action. And yet this leveling was not an unmixed blessing; it destroyed all the smaller knots of resistance by which the great central authorities were kept in check. Thus, in Germany (says Mohl) there is less real liberty than there was two hundred years ago, owing to the havoc which the French Revolution made of local institutions: "The Germans hate their own sovereigns and their petty despotisms, but they will accept no French help against them. They will resist any impulse that comes from France."

The only thing that seems to have outwardly moved the impassive Louis Napoleon was Changarnier's rash boast that if a *coup d'état* was attempted he would drag him to Vincennes. Carlier repeated it; and it was never forgotten nor forgiven. Everything about Louis Napoleon (and all the volumes are full of him) is interesting; for, whatever we may think of the man, the strange fact is unaltered, that for more than twenty years he was able to rule one of the first nations of Europe.

Mr. Senior's own opinion was very strong; he speaks of him as "a man who generally has no plan, and when he has one conceals it, and plays the statesman *en conspirateur*." This feeling may have coloured his impressions of what he heard; but it could not alter the words. "The very army would have turned against the *coup d'état* (disheartened as it was by the silence and disapprobation of the people on the day before) if some fools had not unadvisedly and prematurely raised barricades on 3rd December, 1851." That is Jules Simon's explanation of Louis Napoleon's initial success. It was a surprise—a real *coup*; but had there been no opposition the army would not have followed it up. "Why," Mr. Senior sometimes asks, "do you go on living under a Government that you hate?" Lanjuinais protests against the idea that abject fear is the cause. "Our submission (he says) is produced by deeper and more generous motives—on the fear lest in attempting to obtain liberty we may endanger civilisation;" and he goes on to say that sooner than lose their unrestrained power *celui-ci* and his co-conspirators will treat France as the Austrians treated Galicia, as Robespierre treated Paris, that they will let loose the passions of the mob, rousing the labourer against the proprietor, the

workman against the master, the *peuple* against the well-born. "They threaten us with a general *sansculotterie*; the army combined with the mob would be able to trample Paris under foot." This agrees with the feeling so general among Mr. Senior's friends, that the Emperor was at bottom a Socialist, always ready to coquet with those *rouges*, fear of whom had enabled him to make the *coup*. He is said to have been a Carbonaro; and, as a recreant member, to have lived in constant dread of assassination. Hence his Italian policy, and the change which came over him after Orsini's attempt warned him that the Carbonari had not forgiven him. Auguste Chevalier, in fact, thought as seriously of these secret societies as our late Premier in *Lothair* does of "the Mary Anne." "Nous avons non la Terreur mais le Règne de la Peur," he says, when explaining to Mr. Senior his fear of a sudden outbreak.

But besides the fear lest the attempt to oust Louis Napoleon might lead to the worst kind of social war, Paris was kept down by the huge garrison, not of the *Troupe* (line), but of the *Garde*, i.e., picked men from every regiment, highly paid, privileged in many ways, and comfortably housed, whereas when a line regiment came to Paris it was confined to the forts and strictly cut off from all intercourse with the people. The *Garde* numbered 50,000, and its officers were all elderly men, who had entered the army when there was little education, and had forgotten all the feelings of citizens. They were Louis Napoleon's blind instruments. Guizot thought the army far the best of the great bodies left in France. "The judges, of whom there are 6,000, at salaries rising from £105 to £1,500, are dependent for every appointment and promotion on Government favour. Every judge's life is a struggle, first for existence and afterwards for comfort; it is therefore one of servile subservience. The Church is equally subservient, but to a foreign master. The instant a boy enters a seminary he ceases to be a Frenchman; he is not even an Italian; he is a Papist. As to the administrative body, it is the blind instrument of the executive. Its 35,000 *maires*, its hundreds of *préfets* and *sous-préfets*, its thousands of *cantoniers* and *gardes champêtres* in the provinces, and in the towns its tens of thousands of *receveurs*, policemen, *gendarmerie*, and *employés* of different names and attributions, all appointed, promoted, and dismissed by the Government—not one of whom, whatever be

his misconduct, can be prosecuted without its consent—form with the judges the chains with which France, like Gulliver, is pinned to the earth." And then, when Senior hints that the great chain is the army, "No," replies Guizot, "it is the only body that has any freedom or preserves any freedom for the others. Soldiers have leisure; many read; all talk. They are drawn from the soundest part of our population, and are beloved by the peasantry. A part of the army, brought from Africa and corrupted for the purpose, surprised Paris and enabled Louis Napoleon to turn out an unpopular assembly and to overturn an absurd, unworkable Constitution. And now the whole army is the friend of order, and would rather retain the Empire than run the risk of a revolution."

This is valuable as the last recorded utterance of one with whom Mr. Senior had so many interesting talks; but, looking to the wondrous change which the *coup d'état* made in the state of France, we can hardly accept it as a sufficient reason. "The people love to have it so" always comes in as an echo to every attempted explanation of the success of the arch-conspirator.

With this army, of which Guizot thought so highly, the general testimony was that the Emperor was unpopular. The officers despised his pretensions as a commander, and their contempt spread to the ranks. When Senior remarks that for a man who made the experiment of commanding 150,000 men for the first time after he was fifty the Emperor seemed to have done well, Changarnier shows that he was only saved from total defeat by the still greater folly and incapacity of the Austrians. "He marched his 150,000 in one long line, which any but the silliest imbeciles would have cut through in half a dozen places." Then Hesse stopped the Austrians for four hours on their way to Magenta, and Lichtenstein's inconceivable folly or cowardice at Solferino kept 35,000 cavalry inactive. Of Louis Napoleon's personal courage there were different estimates. No one attributed to him any of the dash which his uncle is supposed to have shown in the mythical bridge of Arcola affair; but Lord Clyde, quoting his friend General Viennois, said that at Magenta he was for some time under fire, and calmly remarked, "At the worst *nous mourrons en soldat*." On the other hand, Trochu told Senior that "As for the two Emperors, they were about equally useless; but the Austrian, exposing himself to fire

and interfering, did perhaps most harm." The French Emperor crossed the Ticino bridge just before Magenta, and returned, asserting that the Austrian army was only a *reconnaissance*. He gave no orders to any one. "Not one of the 250 persons around him was touched. He can scarcely have been under fire. He said he found a battle a very different thing from what he expected. He thought it would consist of manœuvres scientifically planned and carefully executed. He found it a scene of wild disorder, difficult to understand, and governed more by accident than by skill." Changarnier, twice over, spoke even more decidedly. He quoted a letter from one of the Cent Gardes to his mother, saying: "You need not fear for me, for I'm close to the Emperor, and he never goes into danger." He kept two miles in the rear, and at Solferino smoked fifty-three cigars. "His courage is great in theory; small in practice. At Strasburg he ran, and was found in a state of abject terror hiding under a carriage. In the Boulogne attempt, when he was half-way across the Channel, he became alarmed and wished to turn back. The people about him kept him to his purpose by making him half drunk with champagne. On landing he fired at Vaudreuil, who after Strasburg had said that he didn't dare even to fire a pistol in his own defence. His hand shook so that he missed his man at five paces, and wounded a poor cook who was standing at a door hard by. Then he ran to the sea and got into a boat, but being pursued gave himself up and offered them 200,000 francs not to hurt him. These francs he handed to the Mayor, who counted them before the crowd, and found them 120,000. When on his trial he claimed these, and the *cruel* Government of Louis Philippe let him have them. His fur coat lined with bank notes was stolen." Lavergne's view is much the same: "The Duke of Wellington used to say that the presence of the First Napoleon was equal to a reinforcement of 40,000 men. The presence of the Third Napoleon is as much dreaded as a diminution of the army by 40,000 would be." *

Gustave de Beaumont differed wholly from Guizot in his estimate of the popularity of the army. So far from the peasant complacently "paying his debt of service to the

* The famous phrase "baptism of fire" was not (as some of us think) first used of the Prince Imperial in 1870. Mérimée uses it in reference to the Emperor himself at Magenta.

State," he felt bitterly the gross inequality of the cost of a *remplacement*. For £80 (a fabulous sum to a labourer) a rich man could buy off his son and be free for ever.

Of the fusillades after the *coup d'état* Mr. Senior speaks as if there could be no reasonable doubt that they took place. A *juge substitut*, whom Jules Simon met, said: "You are indignant; but I have a right to be far more indignant than you. You have seen only slaughter in hot blood. I have seen men taken by violence, not from behind a barricade or in a street, but out of the protection of justice. As *juge substitut* I was ordered on the fifth and sixth of December to go to the prisons to examine those accused of taking part in the insurrection, and either discharge them or remand them for trial. While I was performing this duty, officers, even sergeants and corporals, entered the prisons, seized the prisoners whom I was examining or had examined, and looked at their hands. If they were blackened with powder the men were carried off, to be shut up till night in a guard-room, and at night shot in the Champ de Mars or the Place des Invalides." Eye-witnesses, of course, there were none; but the Peyronnets who lived in the Champs Elysées, opposite the Champ de Mars, during the nights of the fourth and fifth, heard firing from the other side of the water, and never before nor after. Bloemarts, a watchmaker, was more circumstantial. Some friends of his, whose houses overlooked the garden of the Luxembourg, heard platoon firing on the night of the fifth, and never before nor since. After each discharge they heard cries and sobs, and men imploring mercy. One voice cried out "*Ma mère*," till it was stifled in a scream. They had no doubt these were massacres of prisoners. The strange thing is that, while shooting *ouvriers*, and for one whom he shot sending a hundred to Cayenne or Lambessa, Louis Napoleon was singularly tender of men of mark. On the night of the second, indeed, he planned with wonderful skill to lock up all who could be dangerous; but every one who might be useful if he could be won over was treated with singular leniency.

With little men it was different. Simon told Senior about young Veuillemont, who, after three months' imprisonment for two condemned articles, was walking along by the Column of July, when a man standing at an open door called out to him: "I believe I have the honour of addressing M. Veuillemont. Pray step into this room."

As soon as he entered he was seized by two gendarmes and carried off to Mazat, where he was kept six months and then discharged without a word of explanation. Perhaps despotism culminated in 1862, when under the amended law of *sûreté générale* many offences, before only cognisable by a jury, were subject to summary conviction. While the law was before the Corps Législatif Dufaure said to Senior: "It declares libellous *un écrit ou dessin non rendu public*; therefore under it you, Mr. Senior, will be liable to be prosecuted, summarily convicted and imprisoned, and sent to Cayenne for offensive remarks in your journal."

Very mortifying to the French, thus treated like froward children, must have been the liberty ostentatiously given to English travellers. Montalembert says: "I was in the Pyrenees lately with Maillet. At the gates of Perpignan our passports were asked for. As we had none I said, '*Sujet anglais.*' The man made me a low bow and went to Maillet. '*Et lui aussi,*' I said; '*est sujet anglais et ne sait pas le Français.*' Another low bow, and we passed on. Can Persigny, mad as he is, think that such distinctions do not humiliate us?"

From Madame Cornu Mr. Senior got many interesting notes about the Emperor. She, the wife of an eminent artist, was daughter of Queen Hortense's *dame de compagnie*, and was bred up as a sister with Louis Napoleon, visiting him every year at Ham, and correcting his writings. After the *coup d'état* she broke with him, and for twelve years rejected all his attempts at reconciliation. In spite of this she helped him in getting up his *Cæsar*, writing for him to the German *literati*, just as at Ham she had helped him with his book on artillery. During all his early life, she said, he saw nothing of the higher classes in France, and very little of those in other countries. In Germany, for instance, they would scarcely admit the Bonapartes to be gentry, and would call him Mons. Bonaparte. This did him great harm: The wonder is it did not spoil his manners. It made him a bit of a tuft-hunter, looking up to people of high rank with a mixture of admiration, envy, and dislike. "At a German court (Madame Cornu oncesaid to him) they wanted to make me a *dame d'honneur*, ennobling me as the first step in the process. 'Why didn't you accept?' asked Louis Napoleon; 'you could by-and-by have given up the office and kept your nobility.'

I could not make him understand my contempt for such artificial nobility." Wholly out of sympathy with the feelings of the higher classes in France, he was at one with the mob, who still kept to the old ideas of 1789, despising parliamentary governments, despising the Pope and the priests, delighting in war and profuse expenditure, and believing in the Rhine as the rightful frontier. All, therefore, that he heard between 1848 and 1852 about liberty, self-government, the supremacy of the Assembly, &c., appeared to him the veriest trash. When, therefore, he appealed from the higher classes to the lower they rushed to his side. He deserves no credit for divining the people's instincts; he simply took them for granted, and was right.

Naturally Madame Cornu's judgment was a favourable one: "He is the best of the Bonapartes; power is improving him, notwithstanding his detestable *entourage*." Why these men, far worse (said Montalembert) than Tiberius's senators, were suffered by him, was not only because he could not attract any of the real aristocracy, but because, in Madame Cornu's estimation, he was a bad judge of men, shy, hating new faces, hating to refuse anybody anything. Hence he kept round him those who began with him, and they plundered him and the public. "Even when he was over nineteen he used to say to me: 'What a blessing that I have two before me in the succession, the Duke of Reichstadt and my brother, so that I can be happy in my own way, instead of being the slave of a Mission.' From the day of his brother's death he was a different man. When his son was born his grand object became the perpetuation of his dynasty.

Having spoken of his oft-noticed delight in astonishing men, in making France, Europe, and above all his own ministers stare, Madame Cornu went on: "His powers of self-command are really marvellous. I have known him after a conversation in which he betrayed no anger, break his own furniture in his rage. His moustache is to conceal the quivering of his mouth, and he has disciplined his eyes. When I first saw him in '48 I asked him what was the matter with his eyes, they had such an odd appearance. 'Nothing,' he said. At last I found out that he had been accustoming himself to keep his eyelids half closed and to throw into his eyes a vacant, dreamy expression. . . . Now that he thinks his Mission is fulfilled, his former nature,

feminine in many parts, is returning. His conscience never reproaches him for his massacres and cruelties ; but then no Bonaparte ever has to complain of his conscience. . . . He is slow both in conception and execution. Meditates his plans long ; waits for an opportunity which he does not always seize ; but forgets nothing that he has learned, and renounces nothing that he has planned. Six weeks after he became President he intended a *coup d'état*. He read his plan to Changarnier, and the moment he opposed it he folded up the paper and was silent. But two years and a half after he carried out the plan."

"The ground of the Emperor's character is selfishness. If he wanted to boil an egg, and there was no fuel but a roll of your bank notes he'd use them. If there were none of yours he'd use his own. The form his selfishness takes is vanity. His vanity is vulgarly commonplace." Yet see the very French scene in which he and Madame Cornu and the Empress, and even Madame Walewski, all fall to weeping on the occasion of Madame Cornu's reconciliation with him. At this time his dislike of business details was growing on him. His boy—whom he idolised, and whom but for his wife he would have spoiled—and his *César*, absorbed his whole time. "*Je travaille à me rendre digne de vous*" he said to the Academicians when they came to announce Feuillet's election. He had intended to offer himself for Pasquier's vacancy, feeling he could make his *éloge*, whereas it would be a different matter for him to praise men of Favre's stamp. He delayed, however, till two volumes of *César* were published.

So far Madame Cornu, D.E.F., on the contrary, said that the Emperor was the object of universal distrust ; "by coquetting with the Reds he has lost the *bourgeoisie* whose fear of the Reds, and consequent inaction, enabled him to make the *coup d'état*, and he has not gained those whom he was courting. Even his attempts to serve the *ouvriers* tell against him. He has relieved the *maître sans compagnons* from the *droit de patente* ; well, the consequence will be that thousands of *compagnons* will be discharged. The *ouvriers* hate him for sacrificing French soldiers to keep up the Pope ; the clergy hate him as much as if he had pulled the Pope down."

We are sorry this speaker ventured to accuse Cousin of insincerity : "'Talk as if you were believers,' he used to say to his pupils." This is of a piece with the Protestant

Weiss at the Lycée Bonaparte being scolded for naming Luther with respect, and being told that if he named him at all it must be as an apostate monk, at the same time that the very youths to whom Weiss was lecturing wanted to give Renan an ovation for calling Jesus a mere man.

Lavergne, who ought to have had some sympathy with the Emperor as a consistent free-trader, thus sums up the case against him: "There are no Napoleon worshippers; the first Napoleon is almost forgotten. It was fourteen years ago, remember, that this man got six million votes. The Republic was hated, and *celui-ci* was elected to destroy it. He has done his work, and we are tired of him. The only Bonapartists are those who hope for money or office from him; those who look on him as their bulwark against the Reds (and they are losing confidence); and those who desire at any sacrifice to avert another revolution—who prefer the evils of despotism to those of change."

In trying to explain to ourselves how the French endured for so many years what many of these representative men spoke of as a despicable tyranny, and what no one was satisfied with except those who profited by it, we must take into account the peculiarities of the French character. Prince Napoleon, in one of these conversations, gives a sort of essay on this subject (political conversation in France generally turning more on general propositions than on particular facts). "The French," he said, "*n'ont pas de caractère* (have no individuality). This shows itself in their dread of being in a minority; and also in their want of backbone. A blow from the Government strikes them down, and they lie torpid and inelastic. It was the same 300 years ago; then there was a strong Protestant feeling in France, but it could not stand persecution. Another great fault is their hatred of superiors; the peasant hates every one who wears a coat, and still more every one who wears a cassock." (Some of the other speakers differ widely from the Prince as to the estimate of the clergy.) "The peasant clings to the Government because it is the enemy of his enemy, the *bourgeois*. What the *ouvrier* hates most is his *patron*, and next to him the *bourgeois*. Louis Philippe and his *bourgeois* Chamber were abominations to him; so were the Provisional Government and the Constituent Assembly." This accounts for the success of the *coup d'état*. "He

hates constitutional government, with its checks and counter-checks and hierarchy of power; he hates any intermediate between the Government and the masses. The *bourgeois* hates and fears everybody—people, aristocracy, and Government.” “Why the Government?” asks Senior. “Because it taxes him, forces free-trade on him, . . . emasculates his newspaper, *internes* him or sends him to Cayenne if he talks too loud, interferes with justice if he is defrauded by one of its favourites.” The Prince went on to point out how there were no intermediate bodies, the aristocracy of office giving influence, but no respect. “Hence there is no desire for liberty and no possibility of it.” His hopes were in the press, which had done much to liberalise France since 1852; and he pointed out how repression made the press much more powerful than if it was free, for the fact that the opposition papers exist only on sufferance gives importance to their strictures.

The Prince's views are important as those of the present head of the Bonapartists; but whether or not these were his views it is hard to say. About the clergy, for instance, he has shown that he can think what is most advantageous for his interests. We wonder whether he was correct in saying that thousands of Savoyard families kept little tricolors as sacred pledges, the whole people never, from 1815 to 1859, having given up the hope of coming back to France.

In regard to the hatred of superiors and passion for equality, Jules de Lasteyrie, in a later conversation, explains that the French ideal is not social, but political equality. We are always accusing ourselves of lord-worship; but Lasteyrie's experience was that while in France birth is all-important, in England—in London, at any rate—it is of little value. This exclusiveness was vastly increased by universal suffrage. “The society of Paris,” said Circourt, “is the most aristocratic in Europe except that of Vienna.” Now and then a noble marries a rich *bourgeoise*; but no instance has ever occurred of the reverse. All this aristocratic feeling told against the stability of the Empire; the nobles kept aloof from it. Montalembert truly called the Court nobility, a titled *valetaille*, and the people despised them accordingly. Montalembert's estimate of his countrymen is not high: “They are hounds whose delight is a hunt, and their dread the lash; the only appeal is to their

bad passions or to their fears." No wonder the poor Count almost despaired of humanity.

We said that the estimate of the clergy varied with the speakers. There seems only one opinion about their ignorance. Circourt said Lacordaire was perhaps the most ignorant man who ever entered the Academy. "The clergy," said Lasteyrie, "are not fit to be our companions. The ignorance even of the higher ecclesiastics, and even on their own subjects—theology and Biblical history—is astounding. They never read; they never talk to educated men." "In Rome," remarked Senior, "the Cardinals are good company." "Yes, for there the Church is at home, and therefore at her ease. In Paris she is a stranger. During the fifty years before the Restoration an ecclesiastic was always in danger of hearing offensive things. The clergy, therefore—even those of birth, education and fortune—gradually withdrew from society; and the habit has remained."

Beaumont remarked that reformation is far harder now than in Luther's day. "He, a monk, spoke to his brother monks a language which they understood. Now Protestant doctrines are unintelligible to most of our clergy." Yet Beaumont confessed that if the peasants lost their religion they would become savages: "Their intercourse with the priest alone raises them above barbarism."

It is curious to find men like Odillon Barrot defending the Papal system, because, but for it, "the Catholic priesthood would become the slaves of their Governments, and the Governments, uniting temporal and spiritual power, would be omnipotent."

Of the amount of religion among the French the speakers form very different estimates. Senior is told "the *bourgeois* has no more belief than the *ouvrier*;" and when he speaks of having seen 2,000 *bourgeois* in Notre Dame listening to Père Félix, and 1,000 at the Oratoire listening to Père Gratry, he is told they only go to hear a piece of rhetoric. Kergorlay and Du Bosc agree in speaking of the rural clergy as very unpopular with the peasants: "They are petty, vexatious, ignorant tyrants, all the more so because they are sincere; forbidding the girls to dance, making the wife unhappy if her husband will not confess, interfering in the management of children, and even in the expenses of the household. . . Very few of the higher classes take orders, none except a few enthusiasts. A

farmer, if he wants to make a son a priest, always takes the dunce of the family, the one who has not brains enough to carry on a farm or to push his way in a town. But among the children of the very poor the *curé* picks out the best to be sent to the seminary, and there they push on, and often distinguish themselves. The field open to them is not wide but long. They may be great theologians, great casuists, great orators, even great writers. And their political influence is great; the Congregation (the ultra-religious party) brought about the overthrow of the Restoration in 1830; the Revolution of 1848 was largely due to a reaction against Louis Philippe's anti-Catholic conduct in placing a Protestant on the steps of the throne, and a Protestant at the head of the Ministry."

Prince Napoleon's hatred of the clergy, whom he is now courting, was in Senior's time quite fanatical. It showed itself even at his father King Jérôme's death bed; the Empress and the Princess Clothilde were anxious the old man should not die without the sacraments of the Church: being afraid of a scene with the Prince they had a priest within call, and just as Jérôme was dying, the Prince happening to be absent, the priest was brought in, the eucharist taken, and extreme unction being administered. All at once in came the Prince; the Empress rose and said: "Don't be angry with Clothilde; it is I and the Emperor who wished it done." With true Napoleonic brutality the Prince turned round, kicked open the door, slammed it behind him, and never saw his father again.

Montalembert's estimate of Lacordaire is worth quoting. As a schoolboy and a barrister he was violently anti-Catholic. His conversion was sudden, by what the French call *un coup de la grâce*. Next day he resolved to take orders, and entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, the only peculiarity about him being that he remained as liberal when a priest as he had been when a barrister. His success as a preacher was very slow. Montalembert heard his first sermon (at St. Roch in 1833): "It was a complete failure, and he felt it to be so. 'I may be useful as a teacher (said he); but I have not the voice, or the rapidity of conception, or the versatility, or the knowledge of the world, which a great preacher requires.'" Of history, ancient, modern, or mediæval, he was like his master, Lamennais, profoundly ignorant. His wonderful power as an orator was chiefly due to his moral excellences, which

surpassed even his imagination, his rapidity of conception, his force and facility of expression. "His impressive and exciting delivery, his clear, brilliant, and unpremeditated language, were merely forms in which his boundless love of God and man, of liberty and piety, was embodied. Never was there a man more approaching faultlessness. He had no vanity, though continually breathing the incense which most intoxicates, that which is burned before an orator; no love of power, though he reigned over the opinions and consciences of thousands; no wish for money or rank, or even for fame. His most valued possession was *un cœur détaché de tout*, in which there should be no selfish desires or fears." In the same eloquent strain the speaker went on to note the vast sacrifice which Lacordaire had made in becoming a Dominican, with absolutely no power over his actions, habits, or even over his thoughts. "They might have silenced him, or sent him at an hour's notice to China or Abyssinia. As it was, their austerities killed him."

Speaking of the way in which Montalembert was allowed to attack the Emperor, Senior says, "A century hence your words about the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, destroyed, '*par une de ces mains étourdiment cruelles aux-elles Dieu livre la puissance humaine quand il veut montrer aux hommes le peu de cas qu'il en fait*,' will be quoted as a proof that the press was substantially free under Louis Napoleon, as we quote *præter atrocem animum Catonis* as proof that there was liberty of writing under Augustus." Montalembert's reply is characteristic: "As respects books, the press is substantially free; for books cannot be attacked without the risk of a trial. It is against journals which cannot defend themselves, which may be extinguished by a mere *avertissement*, that M. de Persigny shows his courage."

The subject of Poland frequently comes up in these volumes, seeing that in 1863 took place the last and saddest of Polish insurrections. The Emperor would certainly have had France with him had he supported the Poles; his own feelings, probably, went in that direction; but in this, as in almost everything that he set his mind on, he was thwarted. His pet Mexican scheme failed miserably; poor Maximilian, who had written him *la plus basse des lettres* to secure his appointment as Emperor, suffered in a way which covered his ex-supporter with

ignominy. The Southerners (he was intensely Southern) were ruined. And Poland, too, fell not, indeed, without a protest from European diplomacy, but in spite of an appeal on our part to the Treaty of 1815, which, unsupported by action, the Russians simply laughed at. Mr. Senior discusses Poland with men of all opinions. With Count Ladislas Zamoycki, nephew of Prince Czartoryski, for instance, who, when the Crimean war broke out, wished Lord Palmerston to form a Polish legion in England. This would have crippled Russia more effectually than the taking of Sebastopol. Lord Palmerston, with that love for half measures which has often been the bane of our Governments, declined, saying "he did not wish to make an enemy of Russia." At the same time he allowed a Polish corps, styled Cossacks of the Sultan, to be formed in Turkey as a contingent to our army. Zamoycki, in 1863, thought it a proof of the wonderful vigour of Polish nationality that those thirty years had not Russianised it. Not the nobles only, but the people were thoroughly anti-Russian; as soon as the rising began, the Polish *employés* threw up their situations; a thousand peasants, armed with scythes and pitchforks, crowded to Warsaw.*

To Prince Napoleon Senior confessed that England's active sympathies are confined to nations which have coasts; and added that Poland, while independent, had not presented an edifying picture—the nobles petty tyrants, the people slaves, with none of the forbearance, candour, and justice which free institutions require. The Prince retorted that English policy is selfish: "You never, as we do, fight for an ideal;" and he notes the selfish hypocritical cruelty of Prussia in delivering up the Polish refugees, and saying, "We have not delivered them to Russia, we have only removed them from Prussia." The Prince thought the Emperor would go to war in spite of his Ministers. Carné and Montalembert thought the same; the former said, "In six months we shall send 100,000 men round Jutland, and attack Russia on the Baltic." Circourt notes that Wielopolski, who carried out the offensive conscription, making the levy wholly from the town populations, was a Pole. He added that the bulk of the

* From Zamoycki we learn that the recent *rapprochement* between Hungary and Turkey is but a repetition of what happened at the close of the Austro-Hungarian war. Then Kossuth, Batthyani, and Perczel formally offered their country to the Sultan.

insurgents were the low townspeople and the poor nobles (the Sztachta), who live mostly as retainers of the rich nobles. "These are the people who give the Poles their national character—they have the vices both of a conquering and a conquered race: the *misero orgoglio d'un tempo che fu*, and the cunning and perfidy bred by long oppression. They sigh for the good old times when they were the human beings of Poland, the peasants being mere animals; and when any one of them had power by a *liberum veto* to stop the legislation and policy of the kingdom." These, and the poor townspeople, are the scythemen of whom we hear. Circourt had seen a good deal of Poland; in 1848 Prussia had employed him to distinguish the Polish from the German families in Posen. *Every family wished to be registered as German.* It was the Poles, he says, who introduced serfdom into Russia, when the western Russians gave themselves up to Poland to escape the attacks of Huns and Tartars. The Polish nobles seized the land and gradually made serfs of the peasants. So, when Lithuania and Poland drew together on the marriage of Jagellon with the heiress of Poland, the nobles became Romanist and reduced their peasants to serfdom. Serfdom was not established in Russia Proper (Muscovy) till 1618. It was Mexico which, in 1863, saved Europe from a general war in behalf of Poland. The Emperor felt bound to go on there, and there was no money for a second struggle. It was a narrow escape; such a sober statesman as Drouyn de Lhuys said it was one of the few subjects on which France was unanimous. He urged the danger (pointed out in the "Concurrent Notes" of England, France, and Austria) of having a nation of eight millions unassimilated and unsubdued for ninety years, and he would have set up an independent Poland, if not of the whole nationality at least of the four millions in the Kingdom, which would be as large as Holland or Denmark. "Don't believe Circourt," he said; "he is a strong anti-Catholic, a strong Russian, a weak Frenchman, a fierce anti-Pole." Nor was he disheartened by the quarrels among the insurgents which had driven Langiewicz to flight.

Cieskowski, deputy for Posen in the Prussian Parliament, claimed for Poland twenty-two millions of people in a territory almost as large as Austria, on the same ground (as Senior told him) on which England might claim all the south of France and most of the north. Uriski, another

Pole, confessed that if Poland were re-established she must be the slave of Russia instead of being a barrier against her: "The idolatry of nationality is a return to barbarism. It is the folly which prompted the Ionians to wish to exchange the mild and wise protection of England for the fraudulent despotism of King Otho."

Thiers of course thought just the opposite of Drouyn de Lhuys. "It is cruelty (he said) to hold out the hope of French assistance. There is no remedy till the Poles are civilised enough to submit to the fate to which past follies has condemned them—till they cease to try to make their Government work ill. No people, Polish, Irish, or Venetian, can be well governed against its will."

We have gone into detail about Poland because it presents analogies, which the reader will not fail to draw, with Ireland. The other great foreign question discussed in these volumes is the war in America. Here the most striking thing is the blindness of the Southerners and of so many European statesmen as to the impending result. Thiers alone spoke of the dissolution of the Union as a great misfortune to the whole world; while Senior himself retorted: "If you conquer the South, and force it back into the Union, will you be stronger or happier for having your Hungary, your Poland, your Venetia, your Ireland?" Rémusat talked about the separation as *un fait accompli*. Guizot did the same, while regretting it because it would make the English masters in America. This was in 1861. A year later Hotze, the Mobile newspaper editor, Davis's envoy to England, said that, having at first doubted the success of secession, he was now convinced it would succeed. The real cause of the rupture, he said, was incompatibility of temper. "No two European nations are so different as Northerners and Southerners. The Yankee does not loathe the negro more than we loathe the Yankee. . . . While we could keep him down, even while he was only our equal, we tolerated the Union." The slaves, he thought, knew that emancipation would be another name for death by misery and cold. He expected that Europe would interfere, or that the war would last fifty years.

Slidell, the Commissioner who, with Mason, was seized in the *Trent*, was in Paris in 1862. He, too, told Senior that the Union would never be restored. He was much disappointed that England and France had not recognised them long before, but he thought the war would last for

years unless Europe intervened. Slidell defended slavery : "A superior and an inferior race cannot inhabit the same country on terms of equality. You, in your larger islands, where the negro can squat, have to import coolies. We believe the negro was intended by Providence to be the submissive instrument of a superior race." The selling of children and separation of families he spoke of as a myth. "Freed from the interference, the emissaries, and the fire-brands of the North, our negroes will be happier and more contented than they are now ; and even now they are the happiest and most contented peasantry in the world."

Guizot thought the North was justly punished for its conduct towards Mexico. "It is frightful. Never was a nation treated with such injustice, perfidy, cruelty, insolence. The United States have kept her weak and anarchical in order to rob her the more easily. . . . They are terrible neighbours ; I am glad the Atlantic is between us." Circourt chimed in, and accused the United States of always threatening war, so insolent have fifty years of wonderful prosperity made them. "If the North conquers the South, in ten years it will be the most arrogant, unscrupulous power in the globe. All Europe, and still more all America, is interested in the disruption." "The United States," added Guizot, "is the most disagreeable country to negotiate with ;" and he pays us the compliment to say that England is the best, for, though the English are proud, obstinate, and touchy, and not ready to accept an apology, yet they never deceive. Whereupon Senior cites the case of Peel, who, he says, "wore two masks, one pasted over another." The wildest remark in the whole book was made by Count F  nelon, *   propos* of the "want of traditions" in the Northern army : "If there were a war on the Rhine (said he) we should, at least at the beginning, beat Belgians, Dutch, and Prussians as easily as we beat Austrians and Prussians in 1806 and 1807"! F  nelon, however, was not wider from the truth than was Slidell when he prophesied the complete victory of the South, and the perpetuation of "the domestic institution." Montalembert was a much truer prophet when, deploring Italian unity, he said : "the next thing will be German unity ; and your self-styled English Liberals will have helped to parcel out Europe among a few great sovereigns."

It was the Federal opposition to his Mexican scheme which made the Emperor so distinctly Southern. Thiers

said he was led into the Mexican war by his wife: "Mexico has behaved outrageously to Spain, as she has to every country with which she has had any relations. Spain's spirits and reputation are raised by the Moorish campaign, and the Empress is a true Spaniard." Thiers, however, believed that nothing but European intervention could save civilisation in Mexico. He wanted Europe to interfere effectually, as it did in Greece and Belgium. The French Expedition, with no real aid from England and only obstacles from Spain, he looked on as madness unparalleled since Don Quixote's day. Gutierrez de Estrada, in a long talk with Senior, agreed with Thiers in thinking the only hope for Mexico lay in a monarchy. During his absence in Europe, from 1836 to 1840, the Mexican Republic had been in full swing, accompanied with almost continuous revolutions. On his return he found that wealth, cultivation, almost civilisation had disappeared. Santa Anna felt the same thing, and gave Estrada a letter authorising him to sound the European Governments on the subject. The matter stood over till the outbreak of the American Civil War, for General Scott had, in the most insolent terms, forbidden the Mexicans to think of it. "There are among you (said he) symptoms of a monarchical party. The United States will not allow such a party to establish itself, or even to arise. They will not endure monarchy on American soil. I am here to put down any such party. I am here to annihilate it."

Drouyn de Lhuys, who seems to have looked on Senior as a sort of Foreign Secretary unattached—for he detailed to him all the letters from our Mexican Minister, Sir Charles Wyke, to Lord Russell—was very angry with us for leading the French (as he said) into the Mexican affair and then backing out: "Your jealousy soon began to show itself. It was obvious to us, and to your own minister, and to the commanders, that the real object of the expedition was to erect in Mexico a stable government. Lord Russell, however, wrote to your admiral strictly limiting its object to the protection of British persons and property; as if these can be protected in any other way than by the regeneration of Mexico." Here were "British interests" making our intervention a farce, while the French soon began to grumble at the cost of the war and the unhealthiness of the climate, and to ask, "Why do we fight the battle of England, without her gratitude, or even her good-

will?" To judge from these volumes our foreign policy seldom pleased any one; Americans as well as French were down upon us for our *laissez-aller* system. The South hated us for not actively intervening; the North for not stopping the *Alabama*. "The *Alabama*," cries Minister Dayton, "is manned by English sailors." "And is not your blockading fleet," retorts Senior, "manned by English sailors? How can you prevent a sailor from taking service where he likes?" "In the Crimean war," replied Dayton, "we did much more than you. We actually stopped the building of the *Alexandra*, on the suspicion that she was intended for the Russians. We found our laws, as you have found yours, insufficient. We amended them. You merely fold your arms and allow things to go on opposed to your own municipal laws and to international law, to good feeling and to good faith." Compare this with Prince Napoleon's very unflattering estimate of Lord Palmerston and of English foreign policy as identified with him: "His foreign policy is thoroughly English—bold, almost defiant, in words; cautious, almost timid, in conduct, except where no opposition is to be feared. He gratifies your vanity by his language to all and by his action against the weak. Then his speeches gratify the national taste for triviality and platitudes. . . . A French minister who should talk such commonplace would be pelted." This government by jest Prince Napoleon very inconsistently went on to deduce from aristocratic disregard for public opinion: "Your great men chaff the *Peuple* familiarly, because the *Peuple* is powerless. All parties know that it is the familiarity of contempt. Here the familiarity is real because the equality is real. Our servants are our equals. One of mine left me a year ago; he had been with me for eight years. Now he writes to tell me he has a son, and he hopes to have an opportunity of shaking me by the hand. He will call on me. I shall shake hands with him, and perhaps by-and-by you will meet him dining with me." Thiers, on the other hand, maintained that not the *Peuple* but the *bourgeoisie* were the masters: "The Emperor's great strength (said he) is the conviction of the *bourgeoisie* that the Government which follows him must give liberty to the press, and that a free press will produce revolution after revolution till a new despot again fetters it."

Servants, by the way, in spite of their independence, fared badly in Paris families, and some recent papers in

Blackwood show that the same strange disregard to the comfort and morality of their dependents is still the rule among Parisians. Jules Simon talked of fourteen families in his house, with forty servants, who sleep in kennels, hot in summer, cold in winter, pestilential at all seasons. Another speaker described a house with twelve families and from thirty-six to fifty servants. There are the ground floor, five flats, and the garret. On each flat there are two *appartements*, each consisting of a kitchen, four small sitting rooms, and three bedrooms. There are two storeys of garrets, each servant having a room so small as to be like a coffin, and so low that one cannot stand upright or even sit up in bed. "The inconveniences of your separate houses are nothing to the evils arising from our close congregation. Our garrets are mere schools of vice." The cost of living in Paris may be judged from the price, £440 a year, of an *appartement* on the first floor.

Children in Paris fare worse than with us; they are seldom sent to school, live with their parents, breakfasting and dining with them, and keeping their hours. "I have pitied (says Senior) poor little things of four and five dying of sleepiness, but kept up till nine. On the other hand, they are far better behaved than ours. English children are always trying to attract attention, always obtruding their own wants, opinions, likes and dislikes. French children are quiet and silent, instantly checked if they give any audible signs of their presence. They are neither shy nor vain." From all this we rather learn the feelings of Mr. Senior than the actual state of the case. There is more justice in Madame Anisson's remarks on luncheon: "an institution which governs your whole lives. You breakfast so early that nothing can be done before it. Then in winter you must go out when breakfast is over. Luncheon comes at two; it is over by three, and by four it is dark." There is a great deal to be said for the French breakfast or, in fact, early dinner at eleven or twelve, just as there is for our shorter hours of work, which are the envy of French officials as well as *ouvriers*. Herbert, of the Foreign Office, said: "I only had one day's holiday for three years. We are eminently a literary nation, for we transact everything by writing. I am at it from 9 a.m. till 6 or 7 p.m. That's how we get worn out so soon. You oxygenate your blood by riding, by walking, above all by your two months' holiday. We are slaves of the pen,

the desk, and the lamp all the year round." And yet the English aristocracy work ten times harder than the French. As Michel Chevalier said: "Your highest classes are all politicians. They are among the best speakers in both Houses, they work hard as Cabinet Ministers, and take the lead in the provinces. Ours are men of pleasure, of society, of literature; scarcely ever statesmen." Here (he might have added) is the value of a real House of Lords. "Idleness (he continued) is one of the traditions of our aristocracy. Their education, too, by private tutors or in ecclesiastical schools makes them averse to the roughness of political life. If we had kept the Constitution of the Restoration, with its hereditary peerage and its narrow suffrage, a race of trained politicians would have grown up. But the Legitimists abandoned public life in 1830, the Orleanists did the same in 1848, the Republicans in 1852; and the country is given up to lawyers, soldiers, bankers—adventurers unfitted by knowledge or by habits to direct it."

But we must hasten to a close, omitting much that is interesting about Rothschild, who always said: "*millions de pardons*," instead of "*mille pardons*;" about Fould, whose vanity in insisting on publishing the Budget in 1862 caused so much trouble; about Thiers' dislike for Victor Hugo's poetry; and about Baron Gros, who was anxious that we should interfere to crush the Taepings, and taunted us with "a strange liking for rebels in the East as in the West." We must, however, say a word about the Campana case. Campana was an enthusiastic and successful collector of antiquities, whom Pio Nino, who was fond of him, had put at the head of the Mont de Piété. With the Pope's leave he used the deposits in purchasing and excavating: "My collection (said he) is worth six million francs, and will be security." But Antonelli hated him, and one day, without notice, examined his account and found six and a half millions deficit. Campana was arrested and prosecuted. "My collection (he pleaded) is now worth eight millions, and the Pope gave me leave to use the money." Pio, afraid of Antonelli and of public opinion, weakly said he did not remember the conversation. The Papal valuers (Antonelli's creatures) returned three millions as the worth of the collection, and Campana was condemned to the galleys for twenty years. By-and-by, wanting money, the Pope put up the collection for sale. Russians, French, and

English (represented by Mr. Newton, of the Museum) all wanted to get the pick of it. At last the French Emperor offered five and a half millions for the whole. Then some Roman bankers offered six millions, and it seemed likely the price would rise still higher, and Campana would have to be pardoned. So Antonelli made the Pope refuse to sell save to a sovereign; the Emperor got the collection; and Campana, whose punishment was afterwards commuted for exile, was still considered to have robbed the Mont de Piété of half a million francs. He, poor fellow, lived some time at Naples with his English wife in great poverty. Moral: never do any risky thing without having permission in writing from whosoever authorises you to do it.

By way of compensation for this ugly story we will give a sample of French politeness worthy of the best times. Courcelles, in an absent fit, knocked at the door of Lamartine, who lived in the next apartment to a friend of his. As soon as his name was called out he saw his mistake, and as he and Lamartine, having been friends before, had not met since the latter became head of the Provisional Government in 1848, he ran back, muttering something about a mistake. His note of explanation and Lamartine's reply are so beautiful that we do not wonder Senior copied them out. Our readers will not regret our doing the same:

"La crainte de vous étonner et de vous déplaire m'a seule empêché de m'excuser immédiatement auprès de vous et de Madame de Lamartine de ma méprise d'hier soir.

"Après le premier moment d'embarras me pardonnerez-vous un peu de superstition chrétienne? Je me figure que l'inadvertence qui m'a fait prendre votre demeure pour celle de votre voisin m'est une occasion de vous exprimer les souvenirs qui ont survécu à notre divergence, mon admiration d'un noble écrit sur les affaires d'Italie, tous mes vœux pour vous, et mes respectueux et profonds hommages pour Madame de Lamartine.

"F. DE COURCELLES."

The reply runs thus:

"Mon cher Courcelles,—Je suis bien sensible à votre charmante et délicate lettre. Je n'ai rien reçu de mieux dans ma vie ni en acte ni en style. Soyez heureux du plaisir que vous m'avez fait. Je n'aurais point été étonné, mais j'aurais été charmé d'une rencontre à laquelle j'aurais pu prêter un souvenir d'ancienne amitié.

Je vous remercie d'avoir écouté cette superstition chrétienne, en m'envoyant une si aimable explication. Il n'y a point de superstition pour le cœur; il a toujours raison, car ce qui ne raisonne pas ne déraisonne jamais; écoutez le donc quand il vous parlera en ma faveur, et croyez que vous m'avez causé deux fois dans ma vie une impression durable et douce, une fois par votre amitié et une autre fois par votre souvenir. Présentez je vous prie mes respects à Madame de Courcelles.

"AL. DE LAMARTINE."

The reader will do well to turn from these exquisite sentences to the equally exquisite passage from Lacordaire's *Lectures in Notre Dame* (Senior ii. 165) on the value of deserts as protectors of human liberty. We can only quote the closing lines:

"Oui, retraites inabordables, vous nous conserverez de libres oasis, des sentiers perdus, vous ne permettrez pas à la chimie de prévaloir contre la nature, et de faire du globe, si bien pétri par la main de Dieu, une espèce d'horrible et droit cachot, où le fer et le feu seront les premiers officiers d'une impitoyable autocratie."

We ought to note the brief but picturesque sketches of scenery, &c., which preface the different divisions of the volume. Coutances, and Bayeux (no longer disfigured with its Italian dome), and the glorious Chartres, are all described; but the notes of the Swiss journey of 1861 are the most interesting. The moment the French frontier was passed there was a visible improvement in houses, gardens, fields, and in the appearance of the people. There was also a great difference between Protestant and Romanist cantons. The democratic feeling in parts of Switzerland the travellers found very strong. A field near Vevay was for sale; a large proprietor wished to buy it, and bid more than its value: "I won't sell it to you," said the owner; "we don't want any high ones (*sommités*) here except the Dent de Jaman." There are two interesting conversations with Renan. He pronounces the history of Joseph and the book of Ruth to be examples of narrative poetry, with a measured cadence like that of the Latin in the *Imitatio Christi*. Job he thinks earlier than the Captivity, but so late that the language had become stiff and pedantic; he attributes it to the time of Hezekiah, about Homer's date. "Homer and the book of Job are eminently theistic, but the Greek gods are shrouded in no mystery. They show themselves to us as

they showed themselves to Paris, and a disgusting exhibition it is. The God of Job speaks out of the whirlwind; his only attributes are wisdom and power. . . . The great question in Job is—Is God just? But no answer to it is attempted. . . . The Semitic races cannot argue; their languages are almost incapable of expressing abstract ideas. There is no *discursus* in their minds; they are apprehensive, not deductive. Their moral works are strings of sentences, or rather of single propositions." The strangest thing is that Job—proud, impatient, with the cold, hard, undevout religion of a Bedouin—should have been called patient. The Song must date from before 923, when Tirzah gave way to Samaria. The beginning of the story Renan finds in cap vi. 12, of which our version and that in the Vulgate are nonsense; he renders it: "Imprudente; voilà que mon caprice m'a jetée parmi les chars d'une suite de Prince." The Shulamite is seized in her garden by Solomon's "collectors of beauties for the harem," but after two conversations with the king she escapes to her village (ii. 7). The next act (ii. 7 to iii. 5) describes a meeting with her lover. The next (ending v. 1) she is brought back in Solomon's chariot. Then from v. 2 to vi. 3 she meets her lover in the garden. The fifth act, in the harem (vi. 4 to viii. 5), describes the rejection of Solomon's advances, and her entreaty that her lover will take her away. Cap. iv. contains to verse 7 an address from Solomon to the maiden, and thence to v. 1 her speech to her lover. The other conversation turns on the Gospels. Renan explained "the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head" to be merely a statement that at the time he was on a journey; he had then a settled residence in Capernaum. The substance of his remarks will be found in the first volume of his *Origines du Christianisme*, in which he asserts that the inspiration of the Gospels was an idea introduced by the schoolmen to supply premisses for their disputations; a text from the Bible was to be conclusive in theology just as one from Aristotle was in metaphysics.

One learns, from a sermon by Père Félix, of which Senior gives an analysis, that girls' and youths' friendly societies were in force in France in 1861; he was preaching for a society which took charge of young people as soon as they entered the *ateliers*, and which numbered over 10,000 members.

Senior, as we said, never hides his own opinions, though

he is always careful to let the Frenchman do the talking. Thus he tells an American that he thinks the Irish priests are shamefully (as well as most unwisely) dealt with in not being established.

Of course his strictures on the Emperor and his conviction of his unpopularity were partly due to his being thrown chiefly with anti-Bonapartists. But still there is no doubt that on the whole the feeling of the time is fairly represented. The strength of the Empire lay in the quarrels of its opponents. Men like Lamartine and Montalembert could not work together. We gave an instance of exquisite courtesy in the case of Lamartine; we now add one of the grossest breaches of good manners of which not a clown, but such a man as Montalembert suffered himself to be guilty. In 1850 the Prince President gave a dinner to the Grand Duchess Stéphanie, Lady Douglas, Montalembert, and Lamartine. During dinner scarcely any one but the host noticed Lamartine; after dinner the President gave his arm to the Duchess, and Montalembert his to his acquaintance Lady Douglas. Lamartine followed. Montalembert said, loud enough for everybody to hear: "Look back at the man behind us. 'C'est l'homme le plus malheureux et le plus misérable de la France.'" When the Duchess and Lady Douglas told the story to Madame Cornu they said the President *tressaillit*; Lamartine walked on without betraying emotion or even consciousness.

Some of the most interesting discussions turn on style, by which the French set so much more store than we do. Several speakers would not admit that the English have any great *prosateur* except Bacon; meaning by a great *prosateur* one in whose sentences you cannot change, or add, or remove a word. "Such were Pascal, Bossuet, Voltaire; such is Cousin, if only his matter equalled his form. D'Haussonville puts Guizot far below Cousin in style; Châteaubriand and Courier nowhere; Thiers readable, but very incorrect—"he has never read except to get the knowledge that he wanted to use at once." The evils of this over-fastidiousness are, several of the speakers admit, considerable. "It tempts writers to reject all ideas which they cannot express in the perfect language to which they endeavour to confine themselves." All this may be profitably read along with Mr. M. Arnold's extravagant praises, just as the more political parts of these volumes may

be profitably compared with Kinglake, who, by the way, far surpasses any of the speakers in the violence of the abuse which he lavishes on the men of the Second Empire.

And now we take our leave of volumes from which no reader can fail to draw profit as well as amusement. We have aimed at showing the reader what he has to expect in Senior's journals, and letting a few men like Thiers (who said he would have heartily supported Louis Napoleon had he been willing to be a constitutional king) paint themselves. Behind all their sparkle and intelligence there is the conviction that the mass of the French nation was wholly uneducated in politics, and chose and liked the system which broke down at Sedan. That is the feeling of most of the speakers. "*Celui-ci* has taken the true measure of our masses" is what they never tire of repeating.

The volumes are disfigured by a few misprints, "Gallican" for "Gallician," "incivicism" for "incivism," &c., but they are a notable addition to our knowledge of a time which, since it gave birth to the Anglo-French alliance, has special attractions for us.

We may well close with an anecdote of our own Court. Quetelet, in London on Exhibition business in 1851, was at first dazzled by finding himself "in the presence of the Mistress of the first nation in the world; but the Queen's kindness and ease soon reassured me. Nothing could be more sensible and unpretending than her conversation; and as for the Prince '*c'est le naturel le plus charmant que j'ai jamais connu.*'" The Prince and he talked freely about literary men, and Albert told him he could not quite do as he liked in regard to them: "We should not be able to receive you exactly as we do were you not a foreigner." The Prince here is in fact just as he is painted by Mr. Theodore Martin.

To the journals in Ireland we have called attention because of the exceeding gravity of the present crisis, and the value of Mr. Senior's remarks. He went wholly unprejudiced and thoroughly liberal.

The Irish journals, &c., begin with a visit in 1819, and end with one in 1862. During this time Mr. Senior saw many changes, most of which he had himself advised, for the interest he took in the country was great and continuous. The conversations with Archbishop Whately, Lord Rosse, and others, were revised by themselves; and

in the preface to a partial publication in 1861, the author remarks on their value as historical documents, showing what were the prevalent opinions, hopes, and expectations about Irish affairs at different periods. The journals contain facts of which there will soon be no other record, and also much information which is of present practical value. For, despite changes, the Irish still depend mainly on the potato, and are still tools of the priests, who are ignorant of the commonest economical laws; and the country is still governed by two codes, one kept up by the magistrate, the other by the tenant.

Almost the only thing in Ireland to which Senior gives unqualified praise is the Irish poor-law. The cost of this in 1860, including salaries and rations of officers, was little over half a million; the average proportion of persons receiving relief was in England 1 in 23; in Scotland, 1 in 25; in Ireland, only 1 in 140. The constabulary he rightly characterised as too much like soldiers. The Church he spoke of as it deserved; at the same time he favoured concurrent endowment, and showed how the priests had almost necessarily become ignorant, and though not actively disloyal certainly not actively the reverse.

Painfully searching is the way in which he analyses (in "Ireland in 1843," *Edinburgh Review*, Jan., 1844), the causes of that hatred of the law which is such a sad trait in the character of the Irish. They have never known the law except as an oppressor; and singularly fair is his remark on the agrarian Irish code, that it is exemplary rather than vindictive, directed not against the person, but the act, the victim being generally not the instigator, but those who obey his instigation; not, *e.g.*, the landlord who exacts too high a rent, but the tenant who pays it. The following warning is still needed by legislators: "The first step towards making Irish institutions popular, must be to make them deserve to be so;" and, as to the notion of withholding the franchise, trial by jury, &c., from Ireland, on the plea that "the Irish are unfit for them," he proves its fallacy so long as we admit Ireland to be a portion of the Empire.

The distress during the famine, and the collapse of the help-arrangements, are temperately but forcibly described; and it is important to note the testimony repeatedly brought forward to the bad influence of public works: "To them the people, who now won't even sow their fields, will

fly with avidity, as there they would be able to loiter away their time in pretended labour." Speaking of the relief works at Mount Trenchard, Senior says: "They consist of a road of about half a mile, impassable to carts, and ending in a bog, and about a mile of footpath. For the first the barony is charged £2,000, for the second, £1,000. This, however, is a favourable specimen, for the footpath is of some trifling use, and the road, though useless, does no harm." The jobbery was frightful; the landholders had to pay for all sorts of schemes, the only proviso being that they should be of no profit to any one individual, and if they complained, the Board of Works tartly replied they alone were responsible.

Senior quizzes the teaching in the schools, especially in the Larne Agricultural School, where he asked in vain for the daily amount of potatoes sufficient to feed a man, and for the name of the Queen's mother, and date of her coronation, while the teacher got glib replies to the weight of Jupiter, the thickening of Saturn's rings, whether light is a substance or a condition, and in whose reign Jeremiah prophesied.

Perhaps the strangest person referred to in these volumes is Mr. Hastings, rector of Kilmacrenan, County Donegal, a choice sample of the old Irish militant Churchman. Having served, and still serving in a militia regiment, he took orders, and became curate of Celbridge, County Wicklow; but the state of the country was not such as to enable any good officer to be spared, so he kept his military rank, drew his pay, and on Sundays used to put a gown over his military trousers and boots, and directly he left the pulpit put on his red coat and parade his men. He was rewarded with the rectory of Kilmacrenan, out of which his predecessor had been worried by the fierce contentions of Ribbonism *versus* Orangeism, and Presbyterians against Catholics. He began by inviting the priest and the Presbyterian minister to meet him at the nearest town, Letterkenny, gave them a good dinner and unlimited whiskey punch, and walked with them round the fair. Then and there he engaged them to meet him on the borders of his parish, and they all rode over the whole of it, winding up the evening at the whiskey-cabin. Since that time there have been no religious disputes; when the church wanted repairing the priest sent £2 as his own subscription, and recommended the subscription from the altar.

This shows that there are lighter passages among the grave matter which makes up the chief part of these Irish journals, much of which deserves serious attention at the present crisis.

There are also interesting notes of scenery; there is a good deal about the religious revival of 1826, to the good results of which many with whom our author conversed bore abundant testimony.

We do wish Mr. Senior's remarks on Ireland may be more studied than they have been; he writes honestly and fearlessly, exposing the weaknesses of the people (quoting the Catholic Bishop Doyle's very strong words in reproof of their apathy, their laziness, and their drunkenness), but also pointing out how these bad traits are the direct results of misgovernment and mismanagement, the sort of crop which usually springs up when men will persist in sowing dragon's teeth.

ART. II. — *Zur Geschichte der Predigt.* [History of Preaching.] Charakterbilder der bedeutendsten Kanzelredner in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von Schleiermacher bis zur Gegenwart. Von A. NEBE, der Theologie Doctor, Professor, Pfarrer. Wiesbaden : Julius Niedner. 1879.

It is quite natural that in Germany, the home of the Reformation, the art of preaching should reach a very high pitch of development. One of the great merits of the Reformation was that it restored to God's Word its rightful place in the order of divine service. Enemies of the Reformation are pleased to speak as if this change meant the elevation of the preacher, of his ways and opinions, to a foremost place in God's house. But the reproach is baseless. The centre of interest in Protestant churches is not the personality of the preacher, but the truth preached. This statement may be proved thus:—If the person of the preacher were the centre of attraction, the mainspring of Protestant worship, what he teaches would be a matter of indifference. He might discourse philosophy, art, heresy at pleasure. But it is not so. If some preachers attract more hearers than others, this is only because of the more effective way in which they set forth the Word of God. God's Word remains the grand object of regard. Preaching is simply a means to an end, and that end is faith, holiness, worship in the church. The Roman Church seeks to foster devotion chiefly by services which appeal to sense and imagination. Protestantism seeks to do this by appealing to intelligence and reason. There can scarcely be a question which is the nobler and more effectual mode of appeal. We are therefore not surprised to find that preaching, which is so distinctive a part of Protestant worship, has reached a high point of perfection on German soil. The sermon-literature of Germany is extraordinarily rich. New sermons and new editions of sermons are constantly pouring from the press. If there is any truth in the law of supply and demand, the demand for religious teaching in this form must be very great. Much is said of

the poor attendance at divine worship in Germany. Sermon-readers at least are numerous.

The German preacher adheres far more rigidly than the English one to the fixed Scripture-lessons. The pericope-system, as it is called—a lineal descendant of the *lectiones* of Christian antiquity—rules the German pulpit with almost despotic sway. It is rare to find a series of sermons from texts freely chosen. The German method, while somewhat a fetter, undoubtedly has the merit of unity and order, and secures a definiteness of teaching which contrasts favourably with fragmentary teaching based on texts chosen at random. The idea of the “Christian year” is sacredly cherished. Most of the volumes published contain a series for the whole year, following the order of the public liturgy. We propose, following the lead of Professor Nebe in his very excellent volume, to notice the chief representatives of the German pulpit during the present century.

The first name that comes up for mention is that of Schleiermacher, who has exercised as great an influence on German preaching as on German theology. He was born at Breslau, where his father was an army chaplain, November 21, 1768, and died at Berlin February 12, 1834. Up to his eighteenth year he was educated at Moravian institutions, where, although his philosophical instincts found little scope, he received impressions which he never lost. The insight he there gained into experimental religion undoubtedly exerted a powerful restraint on his innate tendency to religious speculation. Indeed, more than one of his distinctive theories may be traced to his Moravian training. In his *Discourses on Religion*, published in his thirty-first year, which still remains one of his most characteristic works, he laid down the doctrine, which dominates all his subsequent thinking, that the essence of religion lies in feeling, which is the mediating power between knowledge and will. Religion is man's sense, feeling, taste, love for the infinite, the other religious factor being the qualities which make up the peculiar individuality. About the year 1810 Schleiermacher found his true sphere at Berlin as preacher at Trinity Church, Professor of Theology, and Member of the Academy of Sciences. His mission was to vindicate in the highest circles of philosophy the foundations of religion in the nature of man, and the answer which Christianity gives to man's inquiries after God. His preaching was, and is,

only for the cultured. In this respect he remains unsurpassed, if not unequalled. If there seem to us to be serious gaps in his doctrinal teaching, we must remember what an advance it was upon the bold naturalism that threatened to extinguish all religious life. His constant aim was to indicate the points of connection which Christianity has in human nature, to show that in Christ all man's cravings after divine peace and certainty are met. It is to be observed that most of the teachers who have drunk most deeply at the fountain of Schleiermacher's writings have tended to become more definite and positive in their faith than their master. The charm of his sermons for kindred minds is immense. We say "kindred minds." For Schleiermacher's philosophy was essentially Platonic. Plato was his favourite author. His masterly translations of, and introductions to the old master are well known. Minds of the Aristotelian cast will dislike Schleiermacher as they dislike Plato. Not bare reason alone, but reason warmed by imagination and lighted by faith was his guide. The Platonic spirit is apparent in his sermons, with which alone we have here to do.

The sermons are contained in ten volumes, only two of which were published by the author in a collected form. The others were obtained from manuscripts of friends and scholars, and lack therefore the master's revising hand. It was only for a short time that Schleiermacher wrote his sermons before delivering them. The sermons contained in the two volumes issued by himself were written down afterwards. He gathered the material in his mind, brooded over it long, wrote down a few lines—perhaps not even this—and then went to the pulpit. It is characteristic of the master that sermons preached under these conditions are as perfect as if elaborately prepared. Lücke, an intimate friend, once asked him how he attained this reach of perfection. He answered that he early perceived how minute preparation detracted from the freshness of preaching, which ought to be the outgushing of a full soul, and that in order to attain this freedom he at first left the conclusion unwritten, then more and more, until he was able to do without written preparation altogether.

It has been noted as a peculiarity of Schleiermacher's sermons that they are addressed only to Christians, that they suppose all the hearers and readers to be Christians in a more or less advanced state. He believed

that in every man there was a potential child of God, and his one aim was to awaken this into life. He would not admit the possibility of any one resisting the motives of the Gospel, if those motives were but rightly presented. Compare with this theory Plato's idea that all vice springs from ignorance and that virtue follows inevitably from knowledge. Schleiermacher's best defence would be that he was not fitted to be a preacher of repentance, and that he did not set himself up as a law to others.

Of all Schleiermacher's sermons Christ is the central figure—the living, personal Christ, not the Christ of dogmatic theology. From Christ everything begins, to Christ everything returns. Here again Moravian influence may be seen. As is well known, in Moravian hymns and worship the realistic view of Christ's person and work is carried to an extreme limit. The same feature, in a more refined form, appears in Schleiermacher. Dogmatic teaching is thrust aside with scant ceremony. While technical theology is not to be formally introduced into the pulpit, it must always be implicitly present; its substance must be assumed, if Christian teaching is to be clear and definite. It is the want of this element which makes Schleiermacher's faith on this vital subject hazy and incomplete. He argues strongly and beautifully for the sinlessness and divinity of Christ, but the argument will only be conclusive for a certain order of mind. Christ is the pattern, the ideal man after whom all humanity longs. "This demand," he says, "for a perfect man commands universal assent; but it would find no ear to receive it, there would be nothing to lay hold of the help which the gracious hand of love offers, if in the depths of man's nature, despite the corruption into which he has fallen, there were not something higher and nobler, a quiet longing, a secret aspiration which finds its destined object, when in God's kingdom he beholds the Divine gift of love. This it is which enables him to perceive the demand and so to assent to it, that for its sake he begins to struggle against the transitory nature of the world and the manifold corruption generated thereby." Christ redeems us not by His teaching and example, but by His death. "What," he asks, "my dear friends, what is teaching, and especially the teaching respecting what is to be done and not done, which is here chiefly meant, but another law? Christ's teaching commends the Divine will to our understanding

as the highest law, which is never to be supplemented or superseded ; and His example in one respect comes to help the teaching, because thought becomes more vivid by seeing the actual picture, while in another respect it excites the will in a peculiar way to endeavour to imitate. But will this excitement change the nature of the human will ? In the conflict against the law in the members, will not practice always lag behind the clear insight of the understanding ? Will not the innermost consciousness again point out the dissonance between the law in the soul and the law in the members ? Yes, dear friends, it is plainly so ; if Christ works only through teaching and example, we are still in the old path of the law and no redemption is discovered." At the same time Schleiermacher has no sort of sympathy with the Anselmic, rather we should say with the Scriptural, ideas of substitution and satisfaction. The death of Christ saves not by an expiatory virtue in vicarious suffering, but by exercising a sanctifying influence on the sinful. Sanctification is thus confounded with justification, or rather justification is omitted. Man must surrender himself to Christ, become one with Christ. This is faith. Then, life and righteousness and love stream from Christ into man. "If any one is unable to understand how it is possible for him to receive into himself the life of another, which becomes to him instead of his own, he can never have experienced or observed, what a mesmeric influence a noble and lofty spirit exercises when it is brought into contact with weaker vessels and gives itself up to them for the purpose of making them its own. Thus it is with the sun which penetrates into the inmost heart of plants and issues from them again in leaves and flowers,—with a mother's love which smiles into the eyes of the babe and awakes in it love which responds to the mother,—with the general who breathes his own courage into thousands, the same courage meeting him again in their fiery glances. And Christ, who has loved us with Divine love, kindles this very love again in our hearts ; for the will of the Father, to fulfil which was His food and His joy, is nothing but love, for God is love."

The characteristics of Schleiermacher's sermons are clearness and depth. He is never confused, never loses the thread of thought, never digresses, never leaves his meaning to be inferred. Thought rises naturally out of thought. He is simple with the simplicity of a master.

Although Schleiermacher paid no attention to style, making the matter his only concern, his language is not without a beauty of its own. "Not without reason," he says in one place, "in Scripture is God's Word compared in its nature and effects to the light. The light of the sun is pure and colourless as it streams down upon us, but coming in contact with earthly objects it breaks into this and that colour, yet all contributing to the beauty of the earth. When they lie side by side in their natural order and melt into one another, we see depicted the bow of peace in perfect beauty, and only when we again unite together the various broken rays is the pure, uncoloured light restored. So is it with God's Word. Pure in its heavenly radiance has it shone through God's Son upon the earth, but in every one it takes a separate form and breaks into separate colours. The beauty of Christ's Church consists in this, that in the fellowship of believers all these colours are peacefully blended, all diverse human opinions and theories of the one salvation gently melt one into another. This is to speak the truth in love, and when it comes to pass that every one understands all and all every one, then, by the blending of all diversities, will the purity of the heavenly light be restored." No one who seeks brilliant and startling effects need come to Schleiermacher; but whoever admires gentleness, reasonableness, dignity, will admire his sermons.

In Claus Harms we see a perfect contrast to Schleiermacher. Harms was a genuine son of the people and as good a specimen of the popular preacher in the best sense as Schleiermacher was of another type. Yet, strange to say, it was Schleiermacher's *Discourses on Religion* which were the means of turning him from Rationalism to Scriptural faith. A fellow student at Kiel said to him, "I have a book which will just suit you. Read it, and tell me what you think of it." The book was the *Discourses*. He took it home one Saturday afternoon, read without pause deep into the night, began again after a short sleep, read on to the end, went out for a lonely walk, and there and then renounced Rationalism for ever. One thing at least made clear to him by the *Discourses* was that salvation must come from without. This influence of the philosophical on the popular preacher is an interesting phenomenon.

Harms was born in 1778, and died in 1855. In 1816 he became Archdeacon at St. Nicholas Church in Kiel, a post

which no tempting offer, not even Schleiermacher's pulpit in Berlin, could induce him to leave. At the time of his coming, Kiel was given up to Rationalism—university, professors, churches. Harms by his immense energy and force of character, completely turned the tide in favour of the old Reformation doctrines. He did for Kiel what Schleiermacher had done for him and multitudes more.

Nearly twenty series of sermons by Harms have been published. Of these his *Winter und Sommer Postille* remains still the most characteristic, although some of the subsequent series are more deeply imbued with evangelical doctrine. His sermons exhibit him as a strong, rich, original character, a born preacher. The hour that called him to the pulpit was the happiest of his life. His utterances are bathed in emotion. You feel the preacher's heart beating and throbbing in his words. For this reason, while the common people heard him with delight, his influence was far from being confined to them. All classes flocked to his preaching. Some of the most rationalistic of the professors were among his most regular hearers. He spoke not to any particular class, but to the human nature which underlies all differences of rank and training. The comparison with our own Spurgeon is obvious. Harms's constant advice to ministerial students was characteristic: "With tongues! Speak with tongues!" His faith in the power of speech, of persuasion, and argument, and appeal, was great. The title of one of his essays on preaching is, "With tongues! Speak with tongues!" He would have nothing to do with the notion that the way to the heart is through the understanding, maintaining that there is a more direct way, and that a human tongue, touched by the Spirit of God, can find that way. The heart, he says, has its own understanding, and its own diction. Christianity is a life, an experience, and this new life may be attained independently of all processes of reasoning and logic. The preacher is to be a direct organ of the Spirit, and, in order to his being so, must surrender himself to the Spirit's power. "What is preaching?" he asks. "A word about the Holy Spirit. Nay, it should be more, and this is its highest and most difficult office. It should be the Holy Spirit's own language to the hearers, His mouth, His way, His gifts. It is to be His manifestation just as real as that on the day of Pentecost, though somewhat different in form." Not that the Spirit acts indepen-

dently of means. He acts through Scripture and other channels, but all these are nothing without the Spirit's vivifying presence and power. Harms gives good, practical advice to the preachers. The sermon is to be the outflow of all the preacher's thinking and experience. He who labours the whole week at a sermon will soon be unable to make any at all, because the resources from which the sermon is to come will be exhausted. He thinks twelve divisions not too many, if they are tersely and strikingly put. One of his own sermons, and only one, has twelve divisions. It is one on the usurer. "1. For the most part he is dressed sumptuously. 2. His friends are among the great. 3. Bad times are his best times. 4. His sight is keen. 5. His hearing dull. 6. Greed is a passion with him. 7. He sharpens his knife while speaking smooth words. 8. Deceit is his servant. 9. Against sympathy and tears his heart is steeled. 10. His only joy is in gain and plunder. 11. He trembles and shakes, when it is said to him, Depart. 12. The Judge calls."

Harms's power, as will be inferred, was in practical preaching. He abounds in strong denunciation and appeal. His pictorial power is great, and sometimes carried to excess. He made a study, and a successful study, of the sort of speech the people loved. There is nothing abstract in his sermons. Everything is concrete, substantial, living. Take the following monologue of the rich man in hell: "Where am I? Is it true, then? Is there after all a life after death, though I would not believe it, and with stiff neck denied it? Close, ye eyes, once more upon this hateful life, never again to open! Is sleep unknown here? I lie on thorns. Is there no death here? Death, with all its terrors, were tenfold more welcome, so that I might escape these torments. God, Merciful One, but one free moment! Behold him who mocked Thee bending before Thee; grant me one single free moment! I am damned! Are those yonder the saved? Lazarus, Lazarus, I see thee. Now thou art comforted and I am tormented. I have not deserved it of thee, but bring me a drop of water in this flame; ah, but one drop on thy finger to cool my tongue! Thou canst not? Beseech God. It is impossible. Are you there, my godly parents, my innocent children? Had I but died at your years I had been saved. Nay, you see me not; if you did, heaven were no heaven to you. That I see you and cannot come to you, is hell. Who are you

about me? Those who tempted me, and whom I tempted, my companions in the path of evil. What are we now, who were rich and great on earth? How fare we now, who fared sumptuously every day? I wish not to see your tears, to hear your groans; one comfort I would hear. Does any one know of means of comfort? From God alone comes comfort. But God has turned away from us, as we turned first from Him. Oh, cannot I send some one to the earth? Hasten there, ye groans of mine which I groan for ever, and testify to my brethren, my friends, testify to every one who denies or doubts, that they come not to this place of torment. Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leads to destruction, and many there be that follow it." Take the following picture of spring: "Everywhere is life, young, fresh joyous life, life after a conflict that has lasted many weeks. Long did the cold east resist the gentle west. But the birds were sure that the west would conquer. Therefore the lark long ago sang its merry song; therefore came the stork to our poor country, well knowing that it would soon bloom richly; and our children were drawn by the struggling sunbeams into the playground, feeling in the pulsing of their blood that the spring was coming. Now it is here. The hard battle between life and death is fought out. Everything lives, all nature lives again. Look abroad! The earth grows green, daily the young corn rises higher, thicker and thicker becomes the grass, life ripens in plants and trees, every morning a new bloom opens, every morning a thousand flowers unclothe; millions lie on nature's bosom and drink new life! millions, countless millions of plants and seeds are laid by the hand of gardener and tiller on her breast, that she may give them milk and life, to adorn the garden, to deck the field, one day to replenish the stores of man. Everything lives."

Ludwig Hofacker was like Claus Harms in his style of preaching, but unlike him in his short career, dying in 1828, in his 31st year. Eight years previously he had been smitten down by a sunstroke in the streets of Tübingen, and never shook off the effects. But though his course was short, the impression he made was extraordinary, resembling in this respect John the Baptist, whom indeed he resembled also in the character of his preaching. His ministry was purely awakening. He did not attempt to edify. As though he had a presentiment

of an early death, he gave himself to one kind of work, to call sinners to repentance. The means on which he relied for doing this was preaching the love of Christ. Thus there was a certain monotony in his subjects, but there was none in the form. He knew how to vary the mode of treatment endlessly. In passionate devotion to the Saviour he reminds us of McCheyne, who also ran a short but striking course. He was intensely real. His sermons were the outpourings of a devotion which consumed his own soul. They appeared in a fourteenth edition in 1850, and the demand has continued since.

Hofacker was led to spiritual rest through much inward conflict. He tried mysticism and legalism in vain. The temptation to intellectual pride was great in him, and was only kept under by continuous bodily weakness and suffering. St. Leonard's Church, in Stuttgart, was too small for the crowds flocking from far and near. It was nothing strange for hearers to come six or eight hours' journey. A friend of the preacher says that he often saw the vast congregation swaying with spiritual feeling like a field of corn under a strong breeze. Intervals of preaching alternated with intervals spent in search of health, and at last the sufferer fell asleep with the words, "Saviour, Saviour!"

Hofacker's letters, as well as his sermons, contain many hints about preaching. For a long time, he says, he made his preaching and official work the central object of his thoughts; but he soon learnt that the culture of his own heart, of his own spiritual life, should be the central object of thought, and his sermons the natural outcome of this experience. Instead of living in his office, as previously, he lived in God. The minister of the Word must labour to have Christ dwelling in his heart in love. "Let Him fill our hearts," he writes, "with true, fervent love to Himself, so that in the very depths of our heart His name and cross may always shine. He is so loving, so condescending to our weakness, so faithful, so unspeakably faithful. Oh, couldst thou see His heart, how it longs after sinners! Oh, that we rightly understood how inexpressibly great is His love for sinners!" "Blessed be God," he says, "I am not yet used up. Every Sunday I bring the same matter to the pulpit, and yet not the same. It is a wonder to myself, for I have not done it, could not do it. It is the Lord who has hitherto helped me,

and will help me. I lay it down as a rule that whoever preaches Christ, and at the same time seeks after Him, does not exhaust himself. Thy own wisdom is exhaustible, for it is contained in a vessel, and a vessel has a bottom ; but Christ's wisdom is unfathomable. From His fulness must we receive grace for grace."

Hofacker was fond of surprises. "I will tell you a fact, a most wonderful fact, the most wonderful fact that has happened since the world's creation. But I gather from the unwonted attention you are paying that you are on the look-out for a story ; but it is not so. The fact which I am about to relate is true, quite true. Heaven and earth shall pass away before its truth can be disproved. Hear, then ! eighteen hundred years ago, in Bethlehem, in the land of Judæa, the Creator of all things was born of a virgin as a poor child of man !" Wherever Hofacker began, he always ended at the cross." "This," he cries, "was the payment of our debt. He was our Surety. For us, in our stead, simply and solely for us, Jesus hung six hours long on the cross ; for us He was forsaken of the Father ; for us He died ; in our stead He endured all this ; all this took place to atone for our sins. O soul, what have thy sins done ! How has Love, Eternal Love, loved ! Behold this Head, this Head all bruised and bleeding, laden with mockery and scorn ; behold this august countenance, before which the earth shall one day tremble ; behold how it is defiled, how it is abused ! Into this Head no thought ever entered but the humblest, the purest, the most loving towards the Father, the most loving towards the sinner ; this countenance was ever a mirror of kindness, of benevolence, of Divine majesty and glory ; no sinful passion ever deformed these features, and now behold, how this Head is dishonoured ! This is my doing. My pride has put on his head the crown of thorns ; my obstinacy has dealt to Him heavy stripes ; my lustful eyes have quenched the light in His eyes ; my sins have done it. And He permits a wretch like me to raise my head, my sinful head, and, although I am but a worm in God's presence, to hope for redemption. His body avails for my body, His soul for my soul, His blood for my blood, His hands for my hands, His feet for my feet. All is for me, for my brethren and fellow-sinners." "Bethink thyself ! Perhaps thou dost not believe of God that He can freely, of mere grace, blot out and forgive thy sins ; thou believest not

that He is merciful; thou art saying, perhaps, If I only had this or that, if I had love, or humility, or meekness, I would believe. Nay, thou must not believe first, then, thou must believe before. Thou canst not merit grace by thy own righteousness! Take now a great leap from thy own righteousness to the righteousness of Christ! It is a great leap! we are afraid of falling down into an abyss. But we shall not fall down, we shall fall upon a loving Father's heart. Come, let us venture and take this great leap! Come, let us quit our own righteousness and spring across to the righteousness of Christ!" "I know, I see but the merest drop, the smallest point of the mercy of God and compassion of Christ; but I see that it is measureless, fathomless, eternal and infinite as God Himself. Paul stands here, in absorbed contemplation of the merciful love of the Saviour, like a man carried out of himself by night beneath the starry heaven. He knows that the countless lamps he sees are suns and wandering worlds—knows that the starry ocean of the Milky Way embraces a countless host of single orbs, impossible for him to distinguish; knows that still farther than his feeble vision reaches, other worlds and other suns extend, and therefore his spirit is lost in silent adoration and wonder. The Lord is infinite in greatness, almighty in power. But what is the starry heaven, what is the entire visible creation to the love of God and the riches of His mercy! Here all comparison fails, all is too small, too insignificant beside this. Behold the *breadth* of God's mercy. It extends over all creatures, from one end of the earth to the other, from the first fixed star to the last, over all nations, races, languages, tongues. As wide and broad as the world is the mercy of God. Behold its *length*; it reaches from one eternity to the other, from creation's first moment to the New Jerusalem. It is a mighty cord of love, stretching to all eternities. Love never fails. Though everything else is shattered and annihilated, the love of God, the mercy of God remains the same for ever; Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever! Behold the *depth* of God's mercy. The sea may be exhausted, but not God's love. However low a sinner has fallen, though he has touched the lowest deep, the ocean of God's love is greater than his guilt, deep enough to cover all his sins. From this ocean the seraph, standing before God's throne, is drinking, as well as the sinner in need of forgiveness, and it is not

emptied; for that ocean is unfathomable, that love is boundless! Behold its *height*. It is impregnable, unassailable; no angel, no devil, no present, no future, neither death nor life, neither height nor depth, nor any other creature, can overthrow it. From eternity to eternity it stands sure!"

Of Stier and Krummacher there is no need to speak here, as they are well known by works translated into English. If we mention them together, it is not because of any likeness between them. Indeed, no preachers could be more unlike. Stier is everywhere the minute, patient expositor, while in Krummacher exposition is altogether wanting. His text is rather a motto than a theme. Everything is brought to the text, not taken from it. His imagination is highly cultured, but too unrestrained.

C. J. Nitzsch was as great a preacher as he was a theologian and ecclesiastical leader. He was as far above even Schleiermacher in profundity, massiveness, strength, as he was below him in simplicity and clearness of style. While Schleiermacher inclines to diffuseness, Nitzsch is often obscure from excessive compression of thought. It is impossible to deny that Nitzsch's style is difficult. He admitted it himself and made the best apology he could, attributing it to early want of attention to the subject. He said that the Nitzsches had a hard, stubborn tongue, which it was impossible to tame. A student needs to work himself into the preacher's groove of thought and style, but the result well repays the toil. All then becomes grand, luminous, impressive. It is seen that the sentences are "dark with excessive light." The pages groan and labour under the weight of thought. The reader steps forward from light to light, from one height of vision to another. The effect is not unlike the impression of a grand mediæval cathedral. At first all is wrapped in gloom; but as the eye becomes accustomed to the gloom, one point after another grows clear, and the beholder surrenders himself to awe and admiration. Nitzsch is marvellously fresh and original. The reader feels that he is following a master. Nitzsch was born in 1787, at Bornä, near Leipzig, but soon removed to Wittenberg, where his father was General Superintendent and Professor of Theology. Here he received his education and entered upon the professorial labours which for half a century were the joy and delight of his life. In 1822 he removed to Bonn, and in 1847 to

Berlin. In revolutionary days he had a difficult part to play; but his high courage, principle and conscientiousness never failed him. He was often opposed to those in high places, but all respected his unswerving consistency and high spirit. His powers at last gave way under stress of age and years of ceaseless toil. To his friend Twesten he said, "I can neither hear, nor see, nor work, I can only love." He sank to rest in August, 1868.

Nitzsch's greatest work—his *Practical Theology*—to which he devoted the best of his strength and life, discusses the whole theory of preaching with elaborate completeness. This we pass by, only quoting his definition of preaching: "The continuous proclamation of the Gospel with a view to edify the Church of the Lord, a proclamation of the Word of God contained in Holy Scripture, with living reference to present circumstances, and made by duly-called witnesses." Profound knowledge of Scripture and human nature, and especially of the latter, this is what the student will find in Nitzsch's sermons. Nitzsch was a master of Scripture in its whole compass, not so much of the literature of the text, as of its doctrinal contents. Whatever the subject of which he is treating, he concentrates upon it the full light of Scripture teaching. Still more remarkable is his insight into the workings of the human heart. He traces motive to its innermost recess. The soul seems to have no mystery for him. At the same time Nitzsch is no theoretical speculator. He is everywhere intensely practical. Morals, not doctrines, are his forte. Doctrine and practice are for him interwoven and interdependent. Nitzsch's excellence lying entirely in his matter, it is impossible to give illustrative specimens. Julius Müller notes it as one of the peculiar excellencies of Nitzsch's sermons that there are no striking passages, which lend themselves to the purposes of quotation. A single passage would as little give an impression of the whole as a single stone would of York Minster.

Of all German preachers none is more attractive or influential than Tholuck, the richly-gifted, many-sided, genial professor of Halle. Born at Breslau, in 1799, he early gave himself with all the passion of his ardent nature to Oriental studies. After exhausting the teaching resources of Breslau, he repaired to Berlin. Here, when means of support failed, he obtained a post as assistant to the famous Orientalist, Diez. What is more important

still, he came under the influence of Neander and Baron von Kottwitz, by whom he was led to faith in Christ. Up to this time he had made a god of literature, especially that of the East. He read Paul's Epistles for the first time when twenty years of age. He now gave himself to the study of theology, with the result that in 1826 he became Doctor and Professor of Theology at Halle, where he soon became, and for half a century remained, the first name. When he came, Halle was a nest of Rationalism. The whole university rose in arms against the earnest faith of the new teacher; but he soon lived down opposition. The good he did among the students was incalculable. He lived with them and for them and in them. They were the companions of his daily walks, welcome visitors in his home, his hearers in the church. The enthusiasm he awakened was like that evoked by our own Chalmers. His work was done under the pressure of constant physical suffering. If his teaching seems to us defective in some respects, we must remember the circumstances of his days, the bold Rationalism against which he had to contend. He died in June, 1877, his last clear words being, "I have no fear; the death of Christ for me!"

The few works of Tholuck which have appeared in an English dress give but a faint impression of the reach and versatility of his powers. He gathered knowledge in all fields, cast it into new forms, and gave it forth again with the imprint of his own poetic genius. If he cannot be called profound, just as little can he be called superficial. He reminds us most strongly of our own Robertson of Brighton, except that he was master of a breadth of learning to which Robertson could not pretend. As a preacher to cultured youth he has never been surpassed and seldom equalled. He knew the heart of the young, its doubts, its ideals, its yearnings, as few have done. His own experience in youth was of invaluable service to him in this respect. His intense truthfulness and reality, his enthusiasm for all that is beautiful and noble, his power of sympathy, his mastery of attractive speech, all gave him immense influence with the young, and nobly he wielded the influence. He also thoroughly understood the age and preached to it, eschewing all general platitudes. One of his principles was that preaching is not only saying, but doing something. He was fond of systematic preaching, giving courses on the Apostles' Creed, the Augsburg

Confession, and similar subjects. The only sermons of his translated, as far as we know, are contained in a small volume, *Light from the Cross*, published by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh. This volume very aptly represents both the excellencies and defects of Tholuck's preaching. The lessons drawn from the scenes around the Cross are very striking, and couched in fascinating language; but the doctrine of the Cross can scarcely be said to be present at all. As with Schleiermacher, Tholuck's religion is a world of fine, deep feeling. All his sermons are steeped in fancy and emotion. As with his master, also, all Tholuck's thoughts revolve round the person and character of Christ. His heart burned with a deep, passionate love to the Saviour. "I have but one passion," he exclaimed, "and it is He, only He!" "Yes, friends, what the hidden God is, is only revealed to us in Christ; and what the mysterious human heart is, thou only discoverest in His presence. When I behold Him, Son of God and Son of Man, then it flashes upon me that I also am of Divine race; and just so, when I behold Him, floods of tears burst forth, because, alas, God's image in me is shamefully defaced, and that serves in me which should rule. In presence of His obedience I learn my disobedience, in presence of His humility my pride, in presence of His mercy and loveful heart my cold, loveless heart. And as I stood, overwhelmed with shame and confusion, a voice spoke from the throne of glory: Weep not, the Lion of the tribe of Judah has prevailed. Dost thou desire to be made whole? I said: Yea, Lord, thou knowest how much! Then He said: My son, be of good cheer, thou art made whole; rise and follow Me! And I followed Him, and lo, I learnt that He did not deceive me when He said: He that believeth in Me hath eternal life." "Holy Love, I passed Thee by without knowing Thee, as Thou layest concealed under the veil of nature; I was dimly conscious of Thy presence and my heart glowed with desire. Since I beheld Thee in the Son of God, who goes after the lost sheep and invites the weary and heavy-laden, I see Thee face to face, bow the knee before Thee and cry: Eternal Love, pass me not by—me, the poorest of Thy children!" "Ah, did I not once sacrifice to the gods of this world, like Thy people Israel, and did not Thy prophets come one after another and invite me to the living God, and in my blindness I despised them, and restraining Thy thunders and light-

nings Thou art come to me, as to Elijah, in the gentle sighing of the wind? Ah, long-suffering Love, by this long-suffering of Thine I have learnt to be patient with the transgressions of my brethren, and to wait weeks, months, years for their repentance, as Thou hast waited." "Once, ere the Son of God had taught me the name of Father, I cried: Infinite One, to whom I pray, without having a name for Thee! My soul trembled at the thought of His infinity, and cried: Thou King of kings and Lord of lords! But my soul shuddered as it thought of the sceptre of righteousness which this King bears. Now I call Him *Father*, and my soul's inmost longing is satisfied by this name."

A number of other preachers demand mention, however brief. William Löhe and John T. Beck, of Tübingen, stand by themselves. The former, born 1808, died 1872, was pastor at Neuendettelsau, and played a prominent part in the organisation and advocacy of missions and other religious institutions. His *Evangelien-Postille*, fourth edition, 1875, shows him to have been a preacher of mark. He was a thorough textualist. His text possesses him. Instead of bringing matter to the text, like Krummacher, he bends all his strength to bring everything out of it. In style he is pictorial, sometimes excessively so. The Gospel histories have an overwhelming charm for him, and he knows how to make the charm felt by others. At the same time he is a painter of a deeply religious spirit, in this respect resembling the great masters of the middle ages. He loves to adore in silence at the Cross. In the Good Friday sermon he says: "I am silent; I am still; to-day I would say no more, I would go from your presence, prostrate myself in the dust before the altar, and among you also induce such a silence as was once found, according to St. John, in heaven. I would,—for I am overcome and bowed to the dust by the cry of Christ." In the sermon on the Feast of the Circumcision he says: "I cease then to speak of His name, and have only one wish, that all my office and conduct might be glorified into a sermon on the name Jesus and the Lord Jesus. On Christmas Day we saw the incoming of Jesus, and all the angels of God worshipped Him. To-day His suffering and blood and obedience point forward to the outgoing of the Lord. Blessed, blessed be His incoming and outgoing from this time forth for evermore! As long as sun and moon endure, shall His

incoming and outgoing be blessed, and His name shall be above every name when sun and moon shine no longer. His name-day is dear and precious to those who reckon not their life by days. Let us, too, love this name. Let it be on the lips of the babe, on the lips of the dying; our last breath be *Jesus*, and the last sound whispered into our dying ear *Jesus*, and when we enter Jerusalem, the Eternal City, let the first name we utter be *Jesus*. *Jesus Christ*, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever! *Hallelujah!*" Quotations like these not only refute the charge of intellectual coldness sometimes brought against German Christianity: they also indicate a feature somewhat lacking in English sermons,—that of direct worship. The line between preaching and worship need not be drawn so sharply as is often done in England. The preacher should be a worshipper. The sermon should be suffused with the spirit of devotion. Löhe was a purely extempore preacher. While carefully preparing the matter of his sermons, he needed the stimulus of the living congregation to enable him to give order and beauty to the matter prepared.

Beck was a great, original character, one in an age. Born in 1804, he became Professor of Theology at Basel in 1836, and at Tübingen in 1842, dying December 28, 1878. Beck's single guiding principle was the renunciation of the authority of all human teachers, systems, and creeds, and absolute submission to the authority of Scripture. It was a hint of Bengel's to sell everything else for the one pearl which led Beck to adopt this line, and he never swerved from it by a hair's breadth. Under his teaching one hears nothing of Fathers, Councils, Confessions, but breathes the air of Scripture, pure and undefiled. The position is a very extraordinary one, and not to be commended to all. It needs the immense strength and vigour of a Beck to maintain it. In short, one Beck in a century is excellent as a sort of bracing tonic, but one is enough. Characteristically, Beck's pulpit deliverances are called "addresses," not sermons, and fill six volumes. One seems, in reading them, to be transported to the days of Apostolical Christianity, to be reading the Gospels and Epistles fresh from the hands of the writers, before preacher or commentator or Father had spoken or written a word of comment. The effect is singular and decidedly salutary. Beck's fault is in disparaging the helps of which he himself felt no need. At the same time he enforces respect by his

vigorous grasp and masterly treatment of every subject he handles. He is not a mere textualist. Every discourse is a treatise on a definite topic. Scripture forms for the preacher a grand unity, and is the armoury from which all his weapons are taken. All the resources which Scripture supplies he uses with perfect mastery and ease. For a student who can add all that is wanting, Beck's sermons have a great charm. It is interesting to observe how the independent researches of such a mind lead to substantially the same doctrinal conclusions as are given to our hand by systematic theology. "The style is classical in its way, clear and plain, terse and vivid, pure and lofty, strong and expressive."

Not unlike Beck in strong originality is Gottfried Menken, of Bremen, who died in 1831, in his sixty-fourth year. His Homilies appeared in 1858 in seven volumes. His favourite theme was the Old Testament, which he was the means of restoring to its rightful place in the German pulpit. For him, Divine revelation was embodied in history. He loved to trace the gradual unfolding of the Divine will in this field. "Why," he asks, "is not greater attention given in Christendom to the Book which was the light and law of the Son of God during His walk on earth? The New Testament without the Old is like a building without a foundation—like the fragmentary supplement of a history of which the first part is wanting, and which, therefore, can no longer be understood in its height and depth and real truth." His descriptions of the great characters of Scripture are not mere pictures of their external surroundings, but are really psychological analyses of their inner life. We seem in Menken's sermons to see and hear the old Prophets. All that is best in Krummacker comes from Menken. Menken's style is energetic and penetrating. "The words of Divine Wisdom," he says, "are spears and nails; they wound, they penetrate the soul, and one cannot shake them off. In loneliness, at midnight, their tones are heard again; like spirits they reappear; there is no hiding from them, no escaping from them."

Ludwig Harms, pastor at Hermannsburg, where he died, in 1848, in his fortieth year, has been called the Ludwig Hofacker of North Germany. His *Sermons on the Gospels of the Christian Year*, which have passed through seven editions, are only one of several series published by

him. Harms was a strong, stern man, a rigid Lutheran, a very Baptist in denouncing sin. In exposing the vices of different classes, he knows how to call a spade a spade. His father taught him that it was effeminate to weep, and that he should rather be willing to lose his head than shed a tear. "But when through the Spirit's application of the Ten Commandments I learnt my sinfulness, and saw that I was lost and condemned, and my heart was moved at the thought of having sinned against God, I wept like a child." During his brief course he was a veritable son of thunder in the pulpit. His directness is astonishing: "I have but one theory of preaching, that of the Holy Spirit. Preach God's Word boldly, disregard everything else; rebuke the sins and ungodliness of the rich and well-to-do, whether they like it or not, and the sins and ungodliness of the humble, whether they like it or not. Picture Jesus Christ before the eyes of the people; do this above all things; picture Him alike in His suffering and glory; in the congregation pray earnestly for the Holy Spirit. Do not make your sermons, but pray them on your knees. When others are sleeping wrestle on your knees with the Lord for the souls of men; sacrifice time, strength, convenience, everything to the Lord and the spiritual welfare of men. But preach God's Word, whether it be justification by faith or holiness, Gospel or law, preach it without regard to anything else; preach it so that no back door be left open to escape by, without thinking of consequences. To God's Word everything must bend, and no circumstances, no consequences must set it aside. At the same time I beseech you walk holily, preach nothing which you do not practise; utterly avoid everything which tastes or smells of the world. Call everything by its right name, so that others may grasp it at once, in as matter-of-fact a way as possible, that it may not fly over the head." What Harms advised other preachers to do he did himself; his language about drinking, dancing, theatres, licentiousness, could not be excelled in plainness. It must have been a striking scene when on Trinity Sunday he asked the whole congregation to renew their confession of faith. "But now I ask you, as a Christian church, for your confession, and demand, on this sacred feast, in the sight of the Lord, whether from your hearts you believe and confess that there is no God but the Triune God. Whoever holds this faith with sincere heart, let him rise and answer

my question. (The whole church rose as *one man*.) I ask you in God's sight, Do you believe in God the Father? (The whole church answers: 'We believe in God the Father,' &c.) I ask you again before God who tries the hearts and the reins, Do you believe in God the Son? (The whole church repeated the second article.) I ask you again before God, who is present, Do you believe in God the Holy Ghost? (The whole church repeated the last article.) Do you promise, as true Lutherans, to live in this faith, to die in this faith, and thus in life and in death to confess the Triune God? (The whole church answered: 'Yea, we promise to live and die in this faith, God helping us. Amen.'). He thus replies to some of the charges brought against him: "The people coming to me and inquiring after God's Word and the way of salvation is a great grief to the devil, and he lies and blasphemes in the most shameless way; and, in order to keep back the people, says, 'To whom are you Lutherans going? The man is a Catholic, for he prays with the people on their knees. 'No,' the devil lies through others, 'he belongs to the Reformed, for he does not condemn the Reformed.' 'No,' is another devil's slander, 'he is a fanatical Lutheran; bethink you: he teaches that in the Eucharist Christ's flesh and blood is in the bread and wine; he teaches that in holy baptism the Holy Spirit really and truly comes to the babe, and makes it a child of God; this our preachers do not teach, and yet they are Lutherans.' But the devil has another lie; I must be a Methodist, because I earnestly beseech men to be converted. And lastly, in order to fill the people with the utmost terror, the devil lies again: 'He bewitches the people, so that they think only of being holy, and wish to have nothing more to do with the world; yea, more, he forbids the people to work, commands them to do nothing but pray and read; see, everything is beggary in Hermannsburg: the fields are not ploughed, the lands lie waste, half the church is ruined, and those who go there will all be so.'"

Steinmeyer's sermons well deserve the name they bear, *Contributions to the Understanding of Scripture*. They would be more appreciated in private reading than in public delivery. Münkels *The Day of Salvation*, and *The Acceptable Year of the Lord*, have passed through several editions. Dr. Nebe says: "His talent for teaching is quite extraordinary. In nearly all his sermons the text is fully and strikingly expounded; the words are not pressed and

twisted, but taken in their original sense. The introduction is brief, the subject sharp and definite; the divisions, generally not more than two or three, grow out of the text, the entire exposition clear, vivid, and in the highest degree edifying." Arndt and Ahlfeld are voluminous preachers, and as popular as they are voluminous. Their numerous series of sermons have gone through repeated editions. The same may be said of the prelates S. C. Kapff, in Stuttgart, and J. Müllensiefen, in Berlin, who greatly resemble each other in calm, even flow of thought and style. The sermons of Gustave Knak, of Berlin, are full of tender, delicate feeling, as well as poetic grace and beauty. Gerok's possess the same qualities, the glow of poetry and imagination being still more fervid. The following is Dr. Nebe's criticism. "Gerok has deep feeling, a soul easily kindled into passion; his mind is highly cultured, standing on the heights of modern knowledge, and availing itself freely of all the helps furnished by study. He is well versed in Scripture; his whole heart is given to Him of whom Scripture bears witness; at His feet he gladly lays all his natural gifts. He has a large heart, without a trace of confessional narrowness; his harp strikes no notes but those of friendliness, grateful praise, and adoring joy. The language is choice in every respect, worthy of being taken as a pattern; classical, pure and temperate, clear and bright, fresh and vivid, full of perpetual youth and attractive gentleness, genuinely popular, warm and real as life. . . Everything here comes from full fountains, from full Scripture, from a full heart, from a full life. Whereas Knak addresses himself only to devout feeling in order to stir it up to its lowest depths, Gerok seeks constantly to appeal to æsthetic feeling, and render it tributary to deeper religious feeling." That we may not do injustice to others whom we have passed over with slight mention, we may observe that as much might be said of them as of Gerok.

The three living preachers of greatest eminence in Germany are Brückner, Uhlhorn, and Kögel. Brückner's sermons have passed through several editions. He is well described as a powerful, broad-shouldered preacher. All his sermons are the products of wide knowledge, thorough culture, and careful study, and are illumined by all the lights of the age. His style is manly, sensible, strong. The divisions of his sermon on the scene at

Jacob's well are :—1. No soul has gone so far astray but the Lord can find it. 2. No occasion is so trifling but the Lord can use it. 3. No strength is so weak but the Lord can increase it. 4. No beginning is so slight but the Lord can bring it to a prosperous end. The question, "Hast thou entered the Holy of holies?" is thus dealt with : 1. Reconciliation with God is provided; forget it not. 2. Life in God is revealed; neglect it not. 3. Salvation in God's presence is promised; forfeit it not. In the Word of God Brückner sees the remedy for all those evils of the age which he understands so well. "Into His Word Christ has put not only His heart, but His power. What Christ did in His human life, this He is always doing by His Word. The Church must ever hear this Word. It must build on nothing but the Word of God. If it seek any other help it makes flesh its arm. The Word of God alone is the seed of regeneration planted in the soul; the Word of God alone has the power to wound and to heal, to bruise and to bind up, to cast down and to raise. When it threatens, it is a flaming sword; when it blesses, like a fertilising dew. For the salvation of the age there is no means but God's Word. If there is to be peace around us, without God's Word it cannot be brought about. If there is to be peace within us, without God's Word it remains an end ever aimed at but never reached. Before God's Word must everything at last be silent. To it belongs the last word, to it belongs the right for ever and ever!"

G. Uhlhorn's sermons have won for their author very high fame and influence. They combine depth of thought with skill in arrangement and elegance of form. He is pre-eminently expository and doctrinal, keeping close to Scripture, and dealing of choice with the great doctrines of the Gospel. He appeals everywhere to reason, and seeks to enlighten and convince the understanding. His style is often lofty and impassioned, always dignified. The following is a passage from a Christmas-Day sermon, the text being St. John's prologue: "There thou hast St. John's answer to the question: Who is the babe in the manger? It is the Word made flesh, the Only-Begotten of the Father, made man like us, the God-Man, true God born of the Father from all eternity, and also true Man born of the Virgin Mary. There thou hast the great miracle of Christmas transcending all thought and understanding. God is made flesh! Who can grasp it? who can fathom

it? Can God become man, the Infinite a finite being, the Creator a creature, the Almighty a feeble child? Verily, beloved, none of us can grasp it with the understanding, for it is the deepest of all mysteries; but we can believe it, for it is the mystery of love. God is love, love can become everything, even man. Love condescends, stoops down to us; love dwells among us, becomes altogether one of us, one of those it loves. If thou believest in love, thou believest in the miracle of love, in the miracle of Christmas. Yes, beloved, we cannot comprehend it. Who will measure the length and breadth, and height and depth of this love? But we can and will muse on it, muse on God's wondrous way, as it is said: I think on all Thy wonders. God is made man! Is there, then, any contradiction between God and man? Were it really so, it would be impossible for God to become man. But are we not fashioned after God's image? are we not made by Him and for Him? And is it not He, the Eternal Son, the Word from eternity, whose image we bear, who in man's creation has revealed His thoughts of love? How then should it be impossible for Him, who has made us for His fellowship, to enter into fellowship with us; impossible for Him, whose image we bear, to assume our image; impossible for Him, for whom we are created, to be transformed so as to come to us? O beloved, we understand that what was begun when God said, Let us make man in our image, is here completed, when the Only-Begotten of the Father Himself becomes man. God's revelation of love, taking its rise at the Creation, now reaches its climax. Creation itself is completed in redemption. Infinitely high as God is above us, the Eternal above us children of dust, He has come to us, become man, made His abode among us. In Bethlehem is born the man in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. In the manger lies a babe, of whom we must say, This child is man like us; and again, This child is the true God! Sing to the Lord a new song, for He doeth wondrous things. Here is the wonder of wonders! Sing praise, give thanks, worship!"

Rudolph Koegel, of Berlin, is undoubtedly the prince of living German preachers. His sermons are finished specimens of pulpit oratory, polished to the last letter. Koegel is a consummate orator. There is not an effect in the entire compass of rhetoric of which he is not an easy master. An accomplished classic, he is just as thoroughly versed in

all modern literature and theology. On all the religious questions and difficulties of the day he has something to say, and says it in his own unique style. The brilliance is so continuous, the pages are so burdened with declamation and startling surprises, as occasionally to produce a feeling of satiety; we begin to long for more simplicity. But one feels that the style is natural to the preacher, who could speak in no other way. From the first to the last word the reader, and still more the hearer, is held spell-bound. There is nothing unworthy, nothing out of harmony, to break the charm. His expository sermons on the Epistle to the Romans are a masterpiece. With the exception of a few, which touch here and there on local and temporary topics, they are well worthy to remain as models of the very highest style of the preacher's art. What Koegel does in this volume is to take the idea expressed in a verse or paragraph or chapter, and in a few bold lines picture all its elements and bearings. Everything is living, fiery, penetrating to the last degree. The reader wonders how the greatest powers and utmost labour are able to reach such a perfection of art. If we were to translate Dr. Nebe's criticism, to those unacquainted with the subject it would seem extravagant, but not to others. Such sermons would never do indeed for daily food, but as an occasional delectation they cannot be surpassed. Fragmentary quotations do great injustice to such a preacher; but these are all we can give. "Sad it is in these days that, in the very midst of Christendom, the sense of guilt, the need of redemption, the longing for atonement is so seldom found. The poor dupes who threw their coins into Tetzels chest, to ransom their souls, will condemn this generation which fancies it has no need of forgiveness, but simply forgives its own sins. However deeply degraded the religious consciousness that seeks to ransom itself from the grasp of the living God with gold and silver, more deeply degraded still are the conscienceless ones who are not, indeed, without guilt, but without the sense of guilt. With this gross, frivolous generation the Indian penitent, who exposes himself to the fires of the sun to earn righteousness, and walks on iron spikes hundreds of miles with bleeding feet to his idol-shrine, will rise in judgment; the negro towns in the heart of Africa, which every year flog one of their number through the streets and cast him into the river to the universal shout: 'Take away my sins, carry away my

sins,' will rise in judgment; the most erring of peoples, with their false sacrifices, perverse penances and austerities, will rise to condemn those with no sense of need, for even in these caricatures is more religion and more crying after God than among men who like the raven of the deluge drift along upon corpses and corruption and are only happy in their own misery and vanity." An Easter sermon opens thus: "In our midst, ye festive multitude, in the subterranean vaults of this mighty dome rests a community, sleeping the deep sleep of death, in shrouds ancient and modern, great and small. And we ourselves, what are we, despite our festive garb and rejoicing life, but a dying community? for every pulse-beat, every breath drawn is not merely a means of preservation, but also a means of dissolution; every hour deals a wound and the last one kills. And without, around the great city, lie acres covered with ashes of the dead, gloomy abodes which every day open and every day are filled. And from city to city, from country to country, generations wither and perish, and to him that says with boastful triumph: 'Only the living has rights,' it is replied: 'The feet of them that carried out thy neighbour are at the door and shall carry thee out.' All history is a huge vault where a dying race reads the names of the dead, and, wearied with the task, lies down to sleep beside them; one single family tomb, where between those carrying and those carried out there is but one difference, that the one mourn aloud and the others lie voiceless." The same sermon concludes: "And from the midst of the children of rapine and corruption, blooming with the morn and withering at even, steps forth a Son of Man saying: 'I live,' asserting, 'I have life so full, so rich, so mighty, that to millions I give to eat and drink of eternal life!' What sort of a man is he who in sight of death says so proudly, 'I live,' knowing as we do that there is but one above us who says majestically: 'Behold now, that I alone am He and there is no God beside Me! I kill and make alive, I wound and heal, and there is none to deliver out of My hand. For I lift up My hand to heaven and say: *I live for ever!*' Hear, my friends, there is no God beside Him." One of his five sermons entitled *Pro domo*, preached in the market-place at Wittenburg, 1867, on the occasion of the Reformation Festival, ends thus: "In order that on this jubilant day, now hastening to a close, we may not be found as dead

men who bury their dead and adorn the graves of the prophets, in order that the witnesses of stone yonder, the men of bronze here may not open their mouth in accusation against us as against a new kind of pilgrims, relic-worshippers and saint-worshippers, let us now, with these lights burning about us, by prayers and vows kindle the flame of the old faith to new love and hope and endurance, undismayed if, as the final thesis foretells, we as Christians have to follow Christ our Head through cross, death and hell. If Word and Sacrament are with us, if faith and prayer in us, then let fall what will fall, then let threaten whoever may threaten—the voice of a foe in Germany: ‘The house of the Evangelicals is built on sand and will perish in a night,’ the voice of a foe in England: ‘The last fight against Protestantism will be fought on the Brandenburg sands,’ the voice of a Catholic in France: ‘Three hundred years at longest every sect lasts, three hundred years are all but gone, consequently it is all over with the Protestant sect,’—to the three prophets, as *they* deem themselves, to the three dreamers, as *we* deem them, come three answers from the lights of Wittenburg and this commemoration day,—the first only for the gainsayers and away over their heads: ‘The Word shall stand despite them;’ the second only for friends: ‘Awake, Jerusalem;’ the third up to the open heaven: ‘A safe stronghold our God is still!’ Amen.” With such preachers and defenders of the faith as the three last mentioned, the German pulpit and German Protestant faith have surely little to fear. May the German pulpit ever prove itself worthy of its great past and of Luther, its greatest name.

It is impossible to overestimate the influence of the thorough preaching of God’s Word upon an age. “The Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword.” To hurry over the preaching of that Word in a perfunctory way is to neglect one of the most powerful instruments of spiritual influence. The blessing of the sacramental service is for the inner circle of believers; by faithful preaching outsiders are brought within that circle. The prominence given in Protestantism to the Word of God is a return to primitive Christianity. We see throughout the Book of the Acts how the Apostles used the self-same means. Preaching of the truth was their chief weapon. Their success is described in these terms: “The Word of God increased. The Word of God grew and

multiplied. So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed." In one aspect the Book of the Acts is a history of Apostolic preaching. The Protestant principle has therefore the warrant of the highest precedent. It is not otherwise in later times. If preaching had been thrust into a corner in early days, the Church would never have had such preachers as Chrysostom, Augustine and Basil. The Reformers and modern Protestants are the genuine successors of these early evangelists.

ART. III.—*Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford and afterwards of Winchester, with Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence.* By A. R. ASHWELL, M.A., late Canon of the Cathedral and Principal of the Theological College, Chichester. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. London: John Murray. 1880.

THIS first volume of the *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* was all that the biographer, Canon Ashwell, lived to complete. He died while its pages were passing through the press, and only two days after their final revision, leaving but little material arranged for the next two volumes, and nothing written. This sad event is the more to be regretted inasmuch as, had he been permitted to accomplish the task he had undertaken, we should, judging from the volume before us, have had a worthy biography of one of the foremost men of his time, a man conspicuous alike for the shining and attractive qualities of his mind, his unceasing activity, and the important part he played in the affairs of the Anglican Church during one of the most exciting and critical periods of its history. As it is we have only a fragment, complete, however, in itself; and with this the world must for the present be content.

Canon Ashwell evidently eyed his subject from the standpoint of a strong personal regard; but this has not betrayed him into any unfairness or extravagance. He tells the story of the Bishop's life in a clear and sober style, which serves as an admirable setting for the numerous lively and interesting letters which form the chief value and charm of this volume.

It was his intention to have extended this biography to three volumes, corresponding to the three periods into which the public life of Bishop Wilberforce naturally falls: the first ending with the Hampden controversy at the close of 1847 and the commencement of 1848; the second reaching on to 1860, and including such events as the Papal Aggression of 1851, the Gorham controversy on the doctrine of baptism, the revival of Convocation, and the secession to Rome of his brother-in-law Archdeacon

Manning, and his brothers Henry and Archdeacon R. G. Wilberforce; the third contrasting brightly with the dark and stormy period before it, but suddenly terminating in the fatal accident on the Surrey Downs, on July 19th, 1873, an accident which deprived the Church of England of its foremost Bishop and one of its most representative men.

The first period, the one dealt with in the present volume, was, with the exception of 1841—the year of his wife's death—one of continued sunshine. He was happy in his work, growing in power and popularity, and rapidly advancing in Church preferment. At five-and-twenty he was Rector of Brighthelm; at thirty-one Rural Dean; at thirty-six Archdeacon of Surrey; soon afterwards Rector of Alverstoke and Canon of Winchester; then Chaplain to Prince Albert, Dean of Westminster, and, when only just forty, Bishop of Oxford. His name, his family connections, and a fortunate conjunction of circumstances may have had a little to do with such rapid and brilliant advancement; but no one can doubt that the chief cause of this advancement, as well as of the powerful influence which he wielded in Church affairs throughout his public life, is to be looked for in the man himself. Bishop Wilberforce was certainly not what we usually understand by a great man; but he had that happy combination of qualities, not often found associated, which not only rendered him unusually efficient in every post he was called to fill in the course of his ecclesiastical career, but also enabled him to shine in society with a lustre which made him one of the greatest of social favourites. No one can read this biography without feeling that deep religious convictions and sincere piety lay at the root of his character and supplied the leading motives of his life. The influences of a godly home and the counsels and example of his pious and gifted father, William Wilberforce, doubtless gave his mind its first bias in the right direction. One fact alone speaks volumes for the loving anxiety of that father for his son's religious and moral welfare. No fewer than six hundred letters are still extant, commencing when Samuel was twelve years old and was first sent to school, in which, with kindly tact, his faults are corrected, he is counselled as to his conduct, and urged to attend to the duty of private prayer. It must be borne in mind, too, that when this series of letters began, William Wilberforce was more than fifty-seven years old,

that he had other sons to care for, that he was one of the busiest of men, that his health was failing and his sight so bad that he often had to write with his eyes closed, feeling his way along the paper as best he could. Such parental devotion found its issue and reward in the early formed and steadfast religious character of Samuel Wilberforce; though it must be noted that, owing to influences then beginning to be felt, the piety of the son acquired a more ecclesiastical tone than found place in the simpler evangelicalism of the father.

Having decided to enter the Christian ministry, and possessed with a deep sense of its responsibilities, he threw himself into every part of his work with a zeal and devotion which never forsook him. And when to this were added the gifts of a rich and mellow voice, a charming manner, singular tact, a fertile imagination and an inexhaustible faculty of graceful and forcible utterance, we need not wonder that his ministry was so efficient, that it should have early attracted notice, that wider and more important spheres should have been found for its exercise, and that his sermons and addresses should have met with equal favour among the rustics of Brighthelm, the dons of Oxford, and the courtly occupants of the Chapel Royal.

Bishop Wilberforce was not a student, but he read much and took the liveliest interest in all the movements of the great world around him, especially those which concerned the welfare of the Church and the people. He was eminently practical, fond of real business, and spared no pains to master the details of any subject he had to deal with; and being also ready of resource and able in the direction and management of affairs, he naturally became a power in every circle in which he was found, and lent life and force to every movement with which he was connected.

He was a man of astonishing energy and power of work. He would frequently attend some business meeting in town during the whole morning, take the rail to some church opening or other special service, then take another railway journey to a dinner party, get to his room at midnight, write replies to his letters till two a.m., and set off to London again by eight o'clock in the morning. He could work at all times: he even formed the habit of writing in railway carriages, as the dates of many of his letters testify; and more than one of his Episcopal Charges was written while waiting for conveyances. In addition to his

enormous official correspondence and that which he maintained with his many friends, he penned so many replies to persons seeking his advice on matters of personal religion that, his biographer says, "If they were collected, he might have been known as the writer of 'spiritual letters,' as well as having been called the 'Bishop of society.'"

His temperament was of that mobile, sensitive, chameleon-like kind that readily responds to the various turns of mind and conditions of those with whom it is brought into contact, shows an immediate sympathetic appreciation of every point of agreement, and is able to pass at once from the liveliest matters to the gravest, or *vice versa*, without an effort. Such a temperament naturally laid him open to the suspicion of insincerity from those who were only superficially acquainted with him. The epithet "soapy," so commonly applied to him, however apparently applicable, was as unjust as such epithets usually are when meant as a fair description of the man. There can be no doubt that his bland and sympathetic manner was indicative of true kindness of heart and a generous desire to enter into the feelings and do full justice to the views of those with whom he met; and those who knew him well can testify that beneath that pleasant and variable exterior lay a solid character, settled convictions, and great tenacity of purpose. To complete the enumeration of the qualities which made him such a favourite in society we must add his brilliant conversational power and the fund of genial humour which flashed in witty repartee, or glowed in capitally told stories. That there should have been drawbacks and failures in the case of Bishop Wilberforce, as in that of every other eminent man, "goes without saying;" but such as they were it will suffice to refer to them when we come to notice the circumstances with which they were connected.

The Bishop's letters and diaries have supplied this biography with its facts in their proper order, and revealed the motives and feelings which actuated him in the conduct of his public life. Of the letters, we are glad to say, Canon Ashwell has made a large and judicious use, and by their help we are enabled to get close to the writer himself, and to see what Wordsworth calls "the very pulse of the machine." As we cherish the expectation that the intention of the author to complete the biography of Bishop Wilberforce in two additional volumes will ere long

be carried out by competent hands, we shall confine our present notice of the Bishop's life to the portion embraced within the compass of the present volume.

Samuel Wilberforce was the third son of William Wilberforce of anti-slavery memory, and was born at Clapham Common on September 7th, 1805. William, the eldest of his three brothers, was born in 1798, became a Roman Catholic in 1854, and died in 1879. Robert Isaac, the second son, was born in 1802, became Archdeacon of the East Riding in 1841, resigned his preferments and became a Roman Catholic in 1854, and died at St. Alban's in 1857. Henry William, the youngest son, was born in 1807, was Vicar of East Farleigh from 1843 to 1850, when he resigned the living and joined the Roman Church. Few details are preserved of Samuel Wilberforce's earliest years, but with his twelfth year commences that remarkable series of letters from his father to which we have already referred, and which, carefully pondered, as it appears they were, no doubt did much to form his character and guide his conduct during the most critical and impressionable period of his life. The following extract will serve as a specimen of these letters :

"Never omit any opportunity, my dear Samuel, of getting acquainted with any good man or any useful man—of course I mean that his usefulness in any one line should not be counter-vailed by any qualities of an opposite nature from which defilement might be contracted,—more perhaps depends on the selection of acquaintances than on any other circumstances in life, except, of course, still more close and intimate unions. Acquaintances are indeed the raw materials from which are manufactured friends, wives, husbands, &c. I wish it may please God to give you an opportunity of having some good ones to choose out of on your first settling at Oxford. Sir ——— seems a very pleasing young man, but I own I covet a much higher praise for my sons ; and O that I could have reason to believe that they were steadily and sturdily setting themselves to the work of acting on that beautiful as well as forcible description of the character of true Christians which we had two or three mornings ago in our family service, '*Among whom ye shine as LIGHTS in the world, holding forth the Word of Life.*' O my dearest Samuel, what would I give to see you a *φωστὴρ ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ*. O my dearest boy, aim high, don't be satisfied with being hopeful, still less with being merely not vicious. How little do you know to what services Providence may not call you. If, when I was about your age, any one had pointed to me and said, 'That youth will in a few years (not

above seven or eight) be member for the first county in England,' it would have been deemed the speech of a madman. But I can truly say that I would as much rather see you a Daniel Wilson or a Buchanan, as eternity is beyond any given portion of time in the estimate of a reasonable being. There is one particular in your composition which you must watch closely, lest it greatly injure your advance in the Christian life. I mean the dread of ridicule, and, as incurring it, the fear of singularity. Singularity for its own sake I grant is worse than folly; so thought St. Paul also. But we shall find it next to impossible to face it when it is our duty to do so, unless we diligently cultivate the habits of judgment and feeling, by which alone we shall be able to withstand it when duty requires. My time and my eyesight are both expended, and I must stop, not, however, without assuring you how earnestly I shall pray for you to-morrow *inter silvas Mardeni*, 'that you may be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man.' . . . Ever most affectionately yours,

"W. WILBERFORCE."

Samuel Wilberforce entered the University of Oxford as a Commoner of Oriel at the Michaelmas term of 1823. Among the Fellows of Oriel at that time were John Keble, J. H. Newman, and E. B. Pusey; and among its Commoners the two Froudes, Richard and Robert, and Herman Merivale. The "United Debating Society," now so well known as the "Union Society," had just been formed; of this young Samuel Wilberforce at once became a member, soon becoming distinguished as an able and eloquent debater. His politics at that time wore a decidedly Liberal complexion. For instance, he defended the deposition of Charles I., maintained that John Hampden deserved well of his country, and that the Alien Bill of 1793 was an unjustifiable measure. As might be expected from the prevailing Toryism of Oxford, he was nearly always in the minority. But this phase of Liberalism did not last long. From the time of his ordination he was a vehement Conservative, and so continued till the later years of his life, when his Conservatism became much less pronounced, and his sympathies began to revert to the opinions of his youth. The knot of friends which gathered round the brothers Robert and Samuel was nicknamed the Bethel Union, from their avoidance of the Sunday parties then so common, and from the prominent parts which the fathers of some of them were known to take in religious matters. Not that they were at all puritanical; they did not object to whist, and as for Samuel Wilberforce, he

became quite an expert at hurdle-jumping, and often enjoyed falling in with the Garrington harriers, and taking all the fences round Cuddesdon. At the Michaelmas term of 1826 he took his degree, obtaining a first class in classics, and a second in mathematics. In June, 1828, he married Emily Sargent, daughter of the rector of Lavington, his father's friend, and the friend and biographer of Henry Martyn. He was ordained deacon in December of that year, and, a month afterwards, began his ministerial life as curate in charge at Checkenden, near Henley-on-Thames. Here he remained till June, 1830, when he was inducted to the living of Brighstone, in the Isle of Wight, which was given him by his steadfast friend, Bishop Sumner, of Winchester. This was not the only instance of the Bishop's regard; the Sumners never forgot the kindness which his father had shown their family, and became the close friends and, as occasion offered, the generous patrons of the Wilberforces. The following description of his new sphere of labour occurs in a letter to his brother Robert, written a few days after his induction :

"Brighston is a very pretty village, the cottages are neatly built of stone and thatched. They are sprinkled about and interspersed with elm-trees. The church is a very pleasant, pretty edifice. The rectory is a capitally complete house for what it does contain; anything more entirely complete for a bachelor's house you never saw; but for a family house it will not do without some alterations. . . . The principal inhabitants are yeoman farmers, who have inherited their farms from their ancestors, time without mind. The register goes as far back as 1645, and therefore, of course, bears Bishop Ken's handwriting. The income is not, I believe, above £500 a year. I pray God it may be a sphere of useful labour; it is one, I already see, of much more difficulty than Checkenden."

He was now barely twenty-five, settled in a comfortable and independent position, and free to shape his own course. What that course would be soon became apparent. He came into residence in September, and before Christmas he had added a second sermon to the Sunday service, and frequent catechising in the afternoon, together with a week-evening service, and services on the evenings of all the saints' days; he also commenced a Sunday school, set up weekly cottage-services at three outlying hamlets, and established two preparation classes for communicants. No weather was allowed to stop him from fulfilling these

engagements. Such activity as this, combined with his attention to the sick and poor, and his interesting style of preaching, would be sure to result in his acquiring a great deal of influence in his parish. But he had his troubles, and among them that one which vexes the souls of a good many zealous young clergymen of the modern type,—Nonconformist schools and congregations. The Wesleyans were established in his parish. How he dealt with them appears in a letter to Dr. Hook, dated August, 1838, in which he says :

“ When I took possession of my present living, eight years ago, I found in it a Wesleyan meeting, which had been some seven years rooted. The *regular afternoon* service of the village was with them, not above twelve persons being present at the prayers of the church. They had the only Sunday school. By God’s blessing on various plans, I succeeded in regaining them so far to an outward conformity, that at two years’ end the meeting was closed, and the Wesleyans left the parish.”

We could have wished that the good rector had mentioned what the “various plans” were which “by God’s blessing” proved so effectual in reclaiming those misguided sheep and closing their meeting. Were they anything like the methods which many of the zealous young clergy of these days do not think it beneath them to use for the same purpose—bribery, in the form of Church gifts, and intimidation in the shape of threatenings from landlords and employers, whom they instigate to this pious work? Having got rid of the Wesleyans, he no doubt hoped that now he would soon have quite a model parish. But, alas for such hope! the evil came back in a new and terrible form, and one which refused to yield to the “various methods” which had proved so efficacious in the former case. He goes on in the same letter to inform Dr. Hook that—

“ A body of *Ranters* soon crept in from a neighbouring parish. They pretended affection to the Church, laid hold of the strongest Wesleyan villagers, got to prayer-meetings in cottages, by degrees weaned them from the Church, threw off the mask, and made a schism, and now have run up a meeting-house. They have about thirty or thirty-five regular members (out of a population of 700), but have large attendances from curiosity, &c., &c. They touch none but the poorest and most ignorant. Their doctrine is Arminian—perfection, &c.; their arms, strong sensuous excite-

ment, bodily perceptions of the presence of evil spirits, as well as of the Most Holy Spirit of God; their animosity to the Church extreme; their zeal for proselytising unbounded; their apparent sanctity considerable; their self-righteousness fatal. Now can you give me any practical hints as to managing such a set of evil ones, of reclaiming them, or at least of guarding a set of very ignorant people—whom reason scarcely touches, and who can be lighted up at once into a flame of what seems to them spiritual feeling by sensuous excitement—against such deceivers?"

Passing by the question as to the strict accuracy of the above description of Primitive Methodist tenets and doings, which that body is quite well able to deal with, we wonder what "practical hints," if any, the worthy Doctor gave his perplexed correspondent. It is, perhaps, too much to hope that he told him that he had better mind his own work, and leave the poor "Ranters" alone.

During the first three or four years of his settlement at Brighstone Samuel Wilberforce found time, in addition to his parish duties, to write a tract on Tithes, a pamphlet in defence of the Church Missionary Society, a volume of stories called *The Note-Book of a Country Clergyman*, and to send several contributions to the *British Messenger*, of which his friend, Mr. Hugh James Rose was the editor. We find him also forming a monthly meeting of the clergy for discussion and consultation, and making a vigorous though unsuccessful attempt to bring about a union of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society. During the year 1833 his father died at the age of seventy-three, rich in the honour of all good men. Soon afterwards, in conjunction with his brother Robert, Samuel Wilberforce commenced that well-known biography of his father, which in about four years after was published by Murray in five volumes, and met with an immediate and general welcome. Of this Life he published in 1868 a revised and condensed edition in one volume. The preparation of this biography brought the brothers Robert and Samuel into very close relations, and gave rise to most affectionate correspondence, which extended over the next twenty years. The strong affection he felt for his brother Robert made the secession of that brother to Rome, which took place in 1854, one of the heaviest sorrows of his life.

In the spring of 1835 he was brought near to the grave through inflammation of the lungs. On his recovery

we find him still busy with parish duties, his father's biography, frequent special sermons, entertaining numerous visitors, and making occasional excursions to London, when he always took care to hear any pulpit celebrities who might be preaching, never failing to note the fact in his diary, together with his opinion of the sermon. His own fame as a preacher was rapidly spreading; he began to be in great request for occasional sermons, and was now chosen one of the select preachers of the University. In February, 1836, he was appointed Rural Dean of the north-eastern division of the Isle of Wight. In the following March and May he went to Oxford, to take part in the agitation then being got up against the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. Dr. Hampden, of Oriel College, took a "double first" in 1813 and obtained a fellowship, was Latin prizeman the following year, served the usual offices in his College and the University, was appointed examiner in 1829, 1830, and 1831, and was made Bampton Lecturer in 1832. The title of his lectures, when published, was, *The Scholastic Philosophy Considered in its Relation to Christian Theology*. This volume was followed in 1834 by a pamphlet entitled *Observations on Religious Dissent*, intended to support the proposal of the then Ministry to admit Dissenters to the University. In these writings Dr. Hampden maintains the distinction between religion and theological opinion; the former is made up of the facts revealed in the Scriptures, together with the affections, dispositions, and actions suggested by them; the latter is merely human inference from those facts. The facts are true, the theology inferred from those facts *may be* true. As to the former, which are essential, nearly all Christians agree; they differ only as to the latter, which, though important, is not essential. Therefore too much stress should not be laid on theology, as if it were the same thing as religion; nor should theological belief be made a condition of University distinction. In the *Lectures* he endeavours to trace the growth of theological opinions, and their connection with the philosophical notions prevalent at the time. Bold and novel as were such utterances, regarded as emanating from the high places of Conservative Oxford, and helpful as they must have been to the aggressive Liberalism of the day, yet they seem at the time to have excited little attention, and certainly called forth no protest or censure from the University. So far from this, their

author was in the following year made Head of St. Mary Hall, and Lecturer in Moral Philosophy. But if no dissent was publicly expressed, it was not because none existed. There was a party growing up at Oxford, not yet sufficiently strong in number or high in place to make its voice heard with much effect, which did not fail to note these opinions with extreme disapproval. Of this party John Henry Newman was the active, we might almost say the missionary, genius. It numbered among its leading members such men as J. Keble, Hurrell Froude, William Palmer, Arthur Percival, and Hugh Rose. Their numbers increased, and their influence, especially among the younger minds of Oxford, extended daily. Then the famous *Tracts for the Times* made their appearance, which immensely added to the adherents and influence of the party throughout the country. It was now joined by Dr. Pusey, whose ability and vast learning brought still greater strength to the movement. From 1833 it began to make itself felt as a new and most powerful force in the Church of England. Evangelicalism was already on the wane. That Church itself was weary of its own worldliness and inefficiency, and beginning to be seriously alarmed at the spread of a liberalism which bade fair to make a speedy end, as it seemed to many, of both Church and religion together. Never was movement in the Church more gratefully welcomed, especially by young and earnest men. Even those who could not adopt all the views and arguments of the leaders of the movement were wonderfully roused and stimulated by them. In fact, a genuine and mighty revival of ecclesiastical life—and may we not say, to a large extent, of real spiritual life too?—had commenced, which has not yet run its course; a revival which within the last forty years has wrought a marvellous change, apparent even to the most superficial observer, in the tone and spirit of the Church of England generally, solemnising and energising, even in a manner regenerating her clergy, her congregations, and her services. Undoubtedly, the chief cause of the success of the movement lay in the fact that its leaders revived the claim of the Anglican Church to be a branch of the true Catholic Church which, they said, has visibly existed from the beginning, and against which “the gates of hell shall never prevail.” They traced its bishops back to the Apostles, and its faith to the early Christian centuries. They asserted for its clergy all the powers,

and for its sacraments all the virtues which they insisted must necessarily and exclusively attach to those of the visible Catholic Church, which Church they assumed was represented, in the West at least, solely by the Anglican communion and that of Rome. True, this claim was no novelty. It had been urged in the works of some of the fathers of the Anglican Church, and is substantially the theory which is generally supposed to underlie its authorised formularies; but from various causes, among which we may reckon the influence of Evangelicalism during its day of power, this claim had become practically all but dead. Now, however, it was heard again, proclaimed with no uncertain sound, supported by great learning and ability, and recommended with all the weight of saintly character and self-denying life.

Solemn appeals were addressed to the clergy to realise this claim in all its significance and fully to act up to it. This was to be their *Magna Charta*, and without it they and their Church were nothing, or worse than nothing. Looking at all the circumstances, we cannot wonder at the success of a movement like this. It seemed to meet the deep-lying, half-unconscious want of great numbers of the clergy and laity belonging to the vast unevangelical portion of the Church of England. It seemed to strike new life and reality into the Church's formularies and to invest its services with a new dignity and force. The clergy felt the ground firm beneath their feet; they felt they were standing on the same irrefragable rock as the clergy of the great and venerable Churches of the East and West. They could now assume a higher and more confident tone with the Dissenters of their parishes, and their jealous dislike of them as Nonconformists became transformed into a pious zeal against them as heretics and schismatics.

But when the leaders of the movement began to go further, and attempted to show that the Homilies, the Prayer-book, and even the Articles, might be, and ought to be, construed in such a way as, tacitly at least, to agree with all the doctrines held at that time as *de fide* in the Romish Church, then the movement received a check and underwent a change of direction. Leaving the author of Tract XC. and his more logical and fearless followers to hold on their way to Rome, the great body of both clergy and laity betook themselves to that old *viâ media* which, despite the difficulties with which it is beset, is being more

and more fully accepted as the proper and distinguishing position of the Anglican Church. Of this *vid media* Samuel Wilberforce became, as we shall presently show, one of the principal leaders and exponents.

To return to the Hampden controversy. No sooner was it known that Dr. Hampden had been nominated to the post of Regius Professor of Theology, than at once a storm of opposition broke out. Seventy-three resident Fellows and Tutors of Colleges petitioned the King against his appointment; nine heads of houses joined in a similar remonstrance; petitions were sent in from all parts of the country; and at length, by 474 votes against 94, Convocation passed a statute declaring that the University had no confidence in him in matters theological, and depriving him of the office of being one of the number empowered to designate the select preachers at St. Mary's. Into this agitation Samuel Wilberforce threw himself with characteristic earnestness, getting up petitions and of course voting for the statute. Writing to his brother Robert he says: "I had a very pleasing letter from W. F. Hook the other day, giving an account of their diocesan meeting to petition, and speaking very affectionately of the Bishop. The Archbishop does not, I hear, now wish for any more petitions. What evident good the stir about Hampden has done! Doubtless Arnold would otherwise have been a Bishop now."

Early in 1837 he was offered, through Sir Robert Inglis, the important vicarage of Leeds. But this he finally declined in deference to the opinion of his medical advisers, as he had already done in the case of the rectory of St. Dunstan's, in London. This opened the way for Dr. Hook to the vicarage of Leeds, an appointment which he filled with extraordinary ability and success till 1859, when he became Dean of Chichester. "And thus," as our author says, "Samuel Wilberforce was reserved for a long and extensive career of usefulness in the South, while Walter Farquhar Hook was removed to eclipse the work he had already done at Coventry, by doing it over again, on a far larger scale, and by bringing it to far larger issues, at Leeds. Idle as all such conjectures are, the fact of their being so can never quite prevent a momentary speculation as to the modification it might have effected in the history of the Church of England, had Samuel Wilberforce become Vicar of Leeds at the age of thirty-one, and had Walter

Farquhar Hook remained at Coventry. Differing widely in their gifts, in their training, and in the spheres of duty which they were called to fill, no two men did more to bring the Church revival of the nineteenth century to bear upon the Church at large. To the one it was allotted to form and to realise a new ideal of the work and character of an English Bishop; to the other it was given to show what the parish priest of a great town might be and do. The future historian of the Church of England will delight to record their friendship as well as their services and achievements."

It was about this time that Samuel Wilberforce began planning the *History of the American Church*, which was published in 1844. This set him thinking on the subject of Episcopal organisation in missionary work. In November he preached a sermon on the subject, which he was urged to publish. Accordingly he sent off the MS. to his friend the Bishop, asking for corrections. Evidently the sermon was somewhat too high in flavour for the Bishop's palate, for the following entry respecting it occurs in Wilberforce's diary: "Friday, 24th.—Bishop's letter, with my Southampton sermon—perplexed. I am in a false position with him. I do not hold what he *rightly* dislikes in Pusey and Newman, &c., and I hardly know how to disavow *this* without seeming also to disavow what I *do* hold, being more High Church in *feeling* than he is. Lord, keep me humble, and free from the fear of man *which bringeth a snare*." The subject thus mooted was in subsequent years earnestly followed up, until it found its first practical issue in the sending forth of the lamented Bishop Mackenzie, on which occasion J. H. Newman is reported to have said that if the Church of England entered upon such a course as this she must become the Catholic Church of the world. The strong interest which Samuel Wilberforce felt in missions, and the zeal and ability with which he advocated their cause, led to his being frequently called upon to preach and address meetings on behalf of one or other of the two Church Missionary Societies. In August, 1839, accompanied by the Bishop of Exeter, he set off on a tour through that diocese to plead on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. On this tour, which lasted ten weeks, he travelled nearly fifteen hundred miles, and was incessantly occupied with speaking and preaching. The power and unfailing variety of his sermons

and addresses filled those who were associated with him with astonishment, especially the Bishop, who had expressed his expectation of being bored with hearing for weeks together the same things over and over again. Replying on one occasion to some remark on the subject, he said :

"He owed his facility of speech mainly to the pains his father had taken with him that he might acquire the habit of speaking. His father used to cause him to make himself *well acquainted with a given subject*, and then speak on it, without notes, and trusting to the inspiration of the moment for suitable words. Thus his memory and his power of mentally arranging and dividing his subject were strengthened."—P. 149.

These words contain a hint capable, perhaps, in some form of being usefully applied in the training of young ministers, whose efficiency is so largely dependent on their command of an easy, varied and forcible utterance. The missionary deputation tour was eminently successful for the objects aimed at, and at the same time resulted in bringing into wider notoriety Samuel Wilberforce's talents and ability. On his return he was made Archdeacon of Surrey, that post having become vacant through the death of Lord Walsingham, and in the August of the following year he was installed as Canon of Winchester Cathedral. In December he removed to Alverstoke, having accepted his Bishop's offer of that rectory, thus adding £400 a year to his income; and in January of the next year he was made Chaplain to Prince Albert.

Thus far his course had been one of uninterrupted peace and sunshine. Now, however, came the great sorrow which was to leave its deep and chastening impress on his heart for all his after years. On March 10th, 1841, a few weeks after the birth of their fourth son, Basil Orme Wilberforce, his wife died. His letters, and especially the entries in his diary, bear witness to his profound sense of the loss he had sustained and to his solemn conviction that it was intended as a call to a life of fuller consecration to God and to His service. The anniversary of his wife's death was ever afterwards kept as a sacred day, and devoted to solemn memories, resolves and prayers.

Stirring events soon recalled him to that course of unrelaxing labour to which he now became, if possible, more given up than ever. In January, 1841, the famous

Tract XC. made its appearance, to be followed in March by the protest of the "Four Tutors," and the resolution of the Heads of Houses condemning the Tract as "evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of the errors which they were designed to counteract." A short time afterwards Mr. J. Keble resigned his chair as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, when the contest for the vacant post at once became the occasion of a trial of strength between the friends and opponents of the Tractarian movement. The candidate of the latter was Mr. (afterwards Archdeacon) Garbett, and of the former Mr. Isaac Williams, the author of Tracts LXXX. and LXXXVII. Eventually, and according to arrangement between the parties, the latter withdrew, having received only 623 promises of support to 921 given to his opponent. It is significant of Samuel Wilberforce's mental attitude at this time towards the Tractarian movement, that in this contest he took the side of Mr. Garbett. His brothers Robert and Henry, together with many of his personal friends, were devout adherents of that movement, and admiring followers of its able leader, John Henry Newman. Samuel Wilberforce had himself been under the spell of the magician, and for a while had yielded to the subtle charm. But his strong practical sense, his busy life, and his intercourse with men of all shades of opinion in the great world of society, did much in his case to modify the effect. As the views of the party became more pronounced, and their Romeward tendencies more apparent, he more decidedly drew away from them, finally settling into the old *via media*, retaining at the same time, along with much of the high doctrine, much also of the peculiar tone and spirit, the living zeal and devotion, so characteristic of the movement, and which have since pervaded and stimulated the whole Anglican Church.

The following extracts from his letters will serve to indicate his theological position generally, and especially in relation to the doctrines of the Tracts:

BRIGHTSTONE, April 28, 1835.

"MY DEAREST MOTHER,—I well know that we must expect to be calumniated—all persons must who do not fall in with the fashion of the day; and, above all, those who offend that most irritable class, the self-contented religionists of small attainments,

are sure to be maligned. Of all the points you mention, some few only are true; as, for instance, that I do not understand the Articles in a Calvinistic sense. But I maintain that I understand them in their true sense. For, though written in great part by Calvinists, they were not intended to maintain Calvinistic opinions. The errors they were aimed at were the errors of the Scholastic Philosophy, and it is only ignorance which makes many think that they refer to Calvinism where these really are aiming at quite another mark. For the rest, I belong to no school. In many things I do not agree with the few Oxford Tracts I have read; but I do agree, as far as I can, with all those great lights whom God has from time to time given to His Church: with Hooker, and Bramhall, and Taylor, with Beveridge and Stillingfleet, and with the primitive Church of the first three centuries. It may be called Popery by an ignorant or a malicious latitudinarian; but, if I do not greatly mistake, it will one day be found that he was far nearer the Socinian heresy than I to the Romish inventions."—P. 90.

Again, in a letter to Mr. Charles Anderson, dated May 31st, 1836, he writes:

"I am very glad that you so much like Newman's Sermons; the third volume is my especial favourite. It is, indeed, a magnificent thing. Keble is just going to publish a volume which will, I suspect, be admirable. How different Oxford was in our time. There was something so miserably low in —, and such a want of that high tone of intellect and morality which they have now reached. At the same time, I fear they are pushing some things too far. Do you see the *Tracts for the Times*? They are well worth your reading. There are two octavo volumes now published of them, which I wish you would get and read. It is the view of baptism which seems to me to be pushed too far. I mean the deadly state to which they picture sin after baptism to reduce men."—P. 97.

Replying in January, 1838, to a proposal from Dr. Hook to exchange his rectory at Brighthelmston for the vicarage of Leamington, he writes:

"You do not, I hope, make me this offer thinking that I belong to the school of the *Tracts for the Times*. I admire most highly the talents of some of those men: I revere far more their high and self-denying holiness and singleness of purpose: but I cannot agree with them in all their leading views of doctrine (e.g., Pusey's, as far as I understand it, view of Sin after Baptism), and I often find in practical matters that I differ from them, on points and in ways, in which men commonly charge those who

differ from themselves with wrong-headedness, but in which, as it seems to me, they are for enforcing an ancient practice at the expense of a still more ancient principle. I only say this because your letter calls for confidential openness; and, since we know each other's minds less than we did, my taking, as you know, a high view of the Church of Christ, and most deeply regretting the low tone about her peculiar character which many men of the most earnest piety have for the last fifty years maintained, may possibly have led you to identify me with them in points in which in fact we greatly differ."—P. 116.

In the same month we find him writing thus to his friend Mr. C. Anderson:

"I agree with all *you say* about the Oxford School; but *I have some fears*. When did the mind of man not run into extremes? My principal fears are that they will lead to the depression of true individual spirituality of mind in the reaction of their minds from the *self-idolising* of the late religious party, by leading others to elevate solely the *systematic* and communion facts of Christianity; that they will disgust some well-intentioned Churchmen by a fanciful imitation of antiquity, and drive them into lower depths of 'Peculiarity.'* I cannot use all their language about the Eucharist; I cannot bear Pusey's new sin after baptism. They hold up a glorious standard of holiness, and for *us*, my dear Charles, who know well the hopes of the Gospel, and can supply all they leave deficient, it is the very thing needful; but there are ignorant and bowed-down souls who need a more welcoming treatment than their views of penitence will allow."—Pp. 113, 114.

In his sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1838, he opposed the teaching of Dr. Pusey's Tract on Baptism, No. LXVII. Thereupon Newman declined to receive any further contributions from him for the *British Critic*. His joining the "Sterling Club" and becoming acquainted with such men as F. D. Maurice, J. C. Hare, Dr. Thirlwall, Thomas Carlyle, and Chevalier Bunsen, probably tended to widen still further his separation from the Tractarian party. The following passages occur in a letter to Mr. Fosbery, written in March, 1841, in reference to some remarks on his little allegory *The Rocky Island*:

"I need not tell you who know me well, that I believe from my soul, that the clear and full bringing out before every son of

* The word "Peculiarity" refers to the more pronounced members of the Evangelical School.

Adam, whether child or adult, of the Person, office, and work of Christ, our only Saviour, and Him crucified, is the only foundation of true teaching. That I should dread to speak a word which should lead a single soul to look to his own good works, or repentance, or anything in himself, as in any sense, or under any reservation, the cause of his acceptance with God; and that I should fear no less to put any other thing, name or notion, whether devised by man, or an abused ordinance of God, between Christ and the soul as the giver of all its life, the bestower of God's grace, and so the continuer no less than the author of its spiritual being. . . . For the personal piety of the writers of the 'Tracts' I entertain the most unfeigned veneration; but I have other modes of learning doctrinal truth than imbibing it through these feelings, and God's Word seems to me to contradict the points peculiar to their teaching. It is true that I agree with them upon many points, but they are the points upon which (to name no others) Richard Hooker and Bishop Beveridge agreed with them also. They are not their *peculiarities*. My opinions, indeed, have been formed in a far different school. They are those of my beloved father, as I could prove, were it needful, from many written records of his judgment as to the tenor of my ministry, of which, during his late years, he was a most kind, but a close observer. But why do I say all this, which you well know? You know my dread of the 'Tract' doctrine of Reserve, of its coldness and suppression, and earthly wisdom; you know my love and gratitude towards the memory of our great Reformers; you know my fear of robbing religion of its true spiritual character in the heart of the faithful man; you know my abhorrence of Rome, that *caput mortuum* of piety, whether preached through the Papacy or any other system. I am indeed, on the conclusions of my reason and the convictions of my conscience, a decided and uncompromising Churchman. But it is because I believe the Church system is God's appointment for maintaining the life of God in the souls of men; and I cannot therefore substitute a veneration for the instrument for that result for the sake of which the instrument is valuable."

It is interesting to note how the successive manifestations and developments of Tractarianism became to him occasions of more thoroughly defining his own theological position. The publication of his brother-in-law Archdeacon Manning's volume on *The Rule of Faith* called forth a statement of his views on the Bible and tradition, in which the following remarks occur:

"I believe the Bible, and the Bible only, to be the rule of faith. . . . I think the *whole* school of the Tract writers fail here:

that they speak, and seem to love to speak, ambiguously of the necessity of Tradition, &c., &c. . . . Thus, while the Bible is the rule of faith ; whilst every honest man who prays for God's Spirit will be led into essential truth ; whilst this seems to me the important point to bring continually out ; still, on the other hand, I think it most important to remember that the meaning of the Scripture is in each place *one* ; that no other meaning is *the* meaning ; and that there is the highest conceivable improbability that a meaning which suggests itself to one or two persons—be they Fathers or men of the nineteenth century—is the *right* meaning, if it differs from the meaning which God's saints from the beginning have been led to attach to it. This, I think, is what our Article means by calling the Church the keeper and witness of Holy Scripture."

Dr. Pusey ever since he had joined the "Tract" party had been one of its most pronounced and thorough-going supporters. In May, 1843, he preached before the University a sermon on the Holy Eucharist, which created a great sensation. A board of six doctors, which was summoned by the Vice-Chancellor to consider its statements, condemned it, and prohibited the preacher from officiating in the University pulpit for two years. In reference to this sermon Samuel Wilberforce writes thus to his friend the Rev. R. Walker :

"It does *not* seem to me at all to put forward the Transubstantiation view. Its main evil, I think, is a sort of misty exaggeration of the whole truth, which is very likely to breed in others direct errors. It certainly seems to me to be in *tone* un-Anglican. . . . But my main objection to the doctrine of the sermon is in the connection of the remission of sins with the 'Eucharist.' This seems to me to involve two very important errors. First, the whole view denies, I think, the *forgiven state* of the justified man, breaks down the one great act of forgiveness into a number of acts of forgiveness, and so *per contra* denies the true root of *sin*, resolving it into special acts of sin. The whole view seems to me a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith, as explained in the Epistle to the Romans, and adopted by our Church. Then, second, this appears to me directly opposed to our 31st Article. It seems that making the Atoning Sacrifice begin at the institution of the 'Eucharist,' is intended to continue it to every celebration, and that this is directly contrary to the Article. These views, I take it, are almost yours. There seems to me to be in the 'Eucharist' the *seal* of Remission, not the *act* of Remission."—P. 230.

In November, 1845, he had some correspondence with

Dr. Pusey himself, in the course of which the contrast between the two men becomes strikingly apparent, and not less the difference between the theological positions they severally represented. The "Tract" movement had now reached its crisis: Tract XC., especially, had done its work. In February Mr. W. G. Ward's book on the "Ideal of a Christian Church," in which he denounced the Reformation, and affirmed that his signing the "Articles" did not oblige him to renounce any one Roman doctrine, was condemned and himself degraded. In June, Mr. Oakley, of Margaret Street Chapel, was condemned in the Court of Arches and his license revoked for holding similar views, and in November, he, J. H. Newman, and several others, were received into the Church of Rome. The excitement caused by these events was immense. It was just at this juncture that Samuel Wilberforce, who had been made Dean of Westminster only a few months before, became Bishop of Oxford. Dr. Pusey, now the head of the Tractarian party, lost no time in cautioning the new Bishop against countenancing any measure tending to tighten the bonds of clerical subscription in a Protestant sense. In the course of the ensuing correspondence the Doctor avowed his acceptance of all Roman doctrine as it actually stands in the decrees of that Church, and as distinguished from its popular theology; and went on to say, "If our formularies were set authoritatively (*i.e.* by any interpretation of the English Church) at variance with the Ancient (which God forbid!) I should have to give up our formularies." The Bishop's reply was most outspoken, as the following description of the party will indicate:

"With the appearance to themselves of peculiar self-abasement they lost their humility; with great outward asceticism they were ruled by an unmortified will; they formed a party; and thus being greatly predisposed to it, the perverted bias of one master-mind has sufficed to draw them close to or absolutely into the Roman Schism, with all its fearful doctrinal errors."—P. 308.

In a letter written a few days after, he thus refers to his late correspondent:

"I must say a word or two about Pusey. I quite believe him to be a very holy man. I could sit at his feet. But then I see that he is, if I understand God's Word aright, most dark as to many parts of Christ's blessed Gospel. He now, Henry says, acknowledges that what I said of old, in 1837, of his 'Sin after Baptism' view was quite true. I see that he has greatly helped,

and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanisers in the Church, to lead some to Rome, to drive back from sound Church views those amongst us who love Christ, for another half-century, and to make others grovel in low unworthy views of their Christian state, trembling always before a hard Master, thinking dirt, willingly endured, holiness, &c. Now, there must be *some cause* why so good a man should fall into such fearful errors and do such deep mischief, and that cause, I believe, is a great want of humility, veiling itself from his eyes under the appearance of entire abasement. I see it in all his writings and doings. His last letter about Newman, I think, deeply painful, utterly sophistical, and false."—P. 311.

Writing to Mr. Gladstone in December, 1845, in reference to the famous *Theory of Development* which Dr. Newman had just published, he thus defines, incidentally, the function of the Church in relation to the Scriptures :

"For those who believe that the first Divine afflatus conveyed to the Church, in the persons of the Apostles, all truth concerning God which man could know, and that the inspired Word of God is the written transcript of that entire knowledge which it was but given to the Church afterwards to draw out and define with logical accuracy as heresy created the necessity,—for all such the book has no force whatever. . . ."—P. 328.

The above extracts from his letters will indicate not only what acuteness, practical sense, and conscientiousness he brought to bear on such subjects, but how much the controversies of the day occasioned a clearer definition of his own theological position, and deepened his conviction of its soundness and strength. That position was one which would be sure to fail of satisfying the adherents of the several Church parties; for while it had something in common with theirs, it differed as much as it agreed. He became in fact a leading type of modern Anglican High-Churchmanship, which, while strictly conservative in its ecclesiasticism, and too often intolerant towards Nonconformity, and bending its energies rather to the promotion of Church activities than of personal, experimental godliness, is at the same time heartily Protestant as against Roman error, and thoroughly loyal to the fundamental truths of the Gospel.

His promotion to the bishopric of Oxford now gave the fittest and fullest scope for his talents and energy. Years of diligent and successful labour in subordinate spheres of ministerial service had disciplined and prepared him for

the work and responsibilities of this last and highest one. How he succeeded his biographer has strongly, but no doubt truly, expressed in these words: "Bishop Wilberforce has revolutionised the idea of Episcopacy throughout the whole English-speaking world." His diaries and letters show that he regarded his elevation to the Episcopate as a grand opportunity for using to the full all the powers God had given him in the service of Christ and the Church. Days of much self-communing and prayer preceded his consecration, which took place on Sunday, November 30th, 1845, his brother, Robert J. Wilberforce, preaching the sermon. In a letter written a few days afterwards he thus alludes to the service:

"It was a most solemn time. I was frequently well-nigh overwhelmed, but there was, I trust, a Presence with me. I did endeavour to pledge myself for time and for eternity to *Him* who is the Faithful and True; and I humbly hope that He did indeed accept me. Even now it sometimes seems a dream that I have passed into that holy state with such mighty ventures issuing forth on all sides. Every part of the service was most solemn; the prayers, Robert's sermon, with one affecting and beautiful allusion to our beloved father, the consecration prayers, the Archbishop's questions, and then his grave, earnest, subdued tones, and reverend aspect; and behind them I seemed to see the hand stretched out which nails had pierced, and to hear a 'Peace be unto you' which the earth cannot speak."—P. 317.

He entered on his new duties with all his characteristic energy. In a short time he became well acquainted with the peculiarities of every parish in his diocese: he gradually won and kept the goodwill and co-operation of both clergy and laity, with wonderful tact conciliating opposition and smoothing down difficulties, and by his zeal, activity and conscientious thoroughness so arousing the latent energies of all beneath his charge, that schemes of Church improvement and extension were started and all kinds of Church work carried on with a vigour and success unknown before. Confirmation and Ordination are among the most important functions of the Episcopal office. Bishop Wilberforce evidently so regarded them, and in no parts of his work were his devout earnestness and painstaking care so impressively exhibited, and all that was best in him so manifestly put to its highest exercise, as in these. The vicious state of things which had long been tolerated in relation to these ordinances, received its death-

blow at the appointment of Samuel Wilberforce to the See of Oxford. The happy change, thus inaugurated, has since spread throughout the country.

The new Bishop took his seat in the House of Lords on January 22nd, 1846,—the first day of the Session. He at once began to take the liveliest interest in the business, and, before the Session closed, had made his mark as an effective Parliamentary debater. His principal speeches during this Session were in favour of Sir Robert Peel's Bill for the Repeal of the Corn Laws, and against the Bill brought in by the Government for admitting slave-grown sugar into the Colonies on equal terms with that grown by free labour. His admirable speech on the latter subject showed how his old anti-slavery training and convictions kept him from being hurried by his new free-trade opinions into supporting a flagrant injustice. In the following year he took a prominent part in the passing of the "Ten Hours Factory Act," an Act which has done much to improve the condition of our manufacturing population.

Any notice of the Life of Bishop Wilberforce would be incomplete which did not make some reference to his quickness of observation, and the facility with which he transferred to his diaries or to letters generally thrown off at the time, his vivid impressions of the persons with whom he met and the scenes in which he mingled in that great world of society of which he was so distinguished a member. From the specimens which brighten the pages of this volume we select the following. Writing to his friend Miss L. Noel, May 27th, 1845, he says :

" . . . I have been to-day at the Drawing-room. Such a curious sight, as it always is to me. But, oh ! so much of the 'world's breath;' such a wonderful variety of faces: the thin upper lip, the restless, eager, craving eye, the heavy lower face, and the sleepy or large sensual eye; and here and there, as to-day in Miss —, Bunsen's friend, and Lady M. W., and a few more, the calm, bright, intelligent, or retiring eye, of a purity the world cannot blench, and a brightness it cannot fade. Then there was Lady —, the type of a class, deeply worldly, beginning to age, fighting against it to desperation, and playing off two daughters of very great beauty, dressed admirably in a sort of exquisite green, with light flowers; and their hair like a mist floating round them, and only girdled by a wreath of lovely flowers, but seeming decked out like victims, played daily, hourly, minutely in this their sweet girlish youth, by a very clever, reaching mother, for coronets and a settlement."—P. 269.

Early in the year 1847 he was one of the guests at Belvoir Castle, on the occasion of the consecration of a new church at Woolsthorpe, built by the Duke of Rutland. Writing from the castle to his friend Miss Noel, he gives the following description of the place and its residents :

" . . . I got here yesterday about five, lighting at the railroad station on Wm. Gladstone and Mrs. Gladstone, Sidney Herbert and his very nice new wife, Lord Clive, &c., &c. Belvoir Castle is a noble thing. It is quite Windsor Castle on a smaller scale, but more beautiful in situation. The views from the windows are noble, and all is *really* ducal. It is curious to contrast it with Stowe, where I was last week ; here Nature has done all it could as well as Art ; there Nature has given Art no aid. There is far *more* magnificence here and *less* display. Everything is really princely—the band, the Belvoir uniform, the picture gallery. The Duke is a very charming, thin, tall, perfectly gentleman-like old man, living in the midst of his family, beloved by them and loving them ; using all his influence for good, and, with his good sons, having quite raised the character of the clergy throughout the Vale of Belvoir. Lady Adeliza, to whom the Duke presented me as 'the Lady of the Castle,' is a very high-bred, pleasing lady, with much grace and kindness. Lord John really seems quite what Coningsby paints him, and I hope and believe a great deal more than poor Disraeli could easily paint. We had a pleasant evening last night. I sat, at dinner, next to Sidney Herbert. He is full of life and cleverness, and as agreeable as possible. She is a very pleasing, lively, spirited person, with a good deal of pathos, very pretty and pleasing, and, I think, really good. . . ."—P. 396.

The following bits of description, too, are capital of their kind :

"MAGDALEN LODGE, July 5th, 1847.

" . . . I got back to London on Wednesday evening, coming up in a state carriage with Bunsen, Sir R. and Lady Peel, and Count Waldemar. Count Waldemar is a fine, manly, intelligent 'brave,' in look and manner. I had a good deal of conversation with him. Also I had a very curious observation of Sir R. Peel. He was reading the *Quarterly*, and soon settled into Croker's bitter attack upon him, peeping into its uncut leaves with intense interest, and yet not liking to show that interest by cutting ; and so when Madam Bunsen, who saw nothing of what was going on, offered a paper-cutter, courteously declining it, and lapsing into an article on Pantagruelism, to fall again into the old article and peep again into the uncut leaves as soon as all was quiet. . . ."—P. 399.

"EATON PLACE, May 2nd, 1847.

"... I dined the other day in company with Carlyle. He was very great. Monckton Milns drew him out. Milns began the young man's cant of the present day of the barbarity and wickedness of capital punishment, that after all we could not be sure others were wicked, &c. Carlyle broke out on him with, 'None of your heaven and hell amalgamation companies for me. We do know what is wickedness. I know wicked men; men whom I would not live with: men whom under some conceivable circumstances I would kill or they should kill me. No, Milns, there is no truth or greatness in all that. It's just poor miserable littleness. There was far more greatness in the way of your old German fathers, who, when they found one of those wicked men, dragged him to a peat bog, and thrust him in and said, *There, go in there.* There is the place for all such as thee.'"—P. 400.

When the first two years of Bishop Wilberforce's episcopate had passed, an event occurred which proved a sinister omen of change in his hitherto bright and peaceful course; for the action he took in relation to it involved him in such controversy and obloquy as darkened and troubled his life, not only at the time but for years after. We allude, of course, to the elevation of Dr. Hampden, then Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to the bishopric of Hereford, vacated by the translation of Dr. Musgrave to the archbishopric of York. No sooner was it announced that Lord John Russell had nominated Dr. Hampden to the vacant See, than a tremendous storm of opposition broke out. We have already alluded to the statute passed by the Oxford University Convocation in 1836, by an immense majority, declaring that it had no confidence in him as a teacher of theology. An attempt was made in 1842 to repeal this statute, but it failed. He was therefore still under this censure when, on November 15th, 1847, his nomination to the bishopric of Hereford was made public. Astonishment and alarm filled the minds of great numbers of the clergy. Meetings were held and remonstrances were signed. The *Times*, the *Morning Post*, the *Record*, all denounced the appointment. So strong was the feeling that thirteen Bishops, of whom Bishop Wilberforce was one, signed a remonstrance addressed to the Prime Minister, expressing their conviction that if the appointment were completed there would be the greatest danger of the peace of the Church being broken, and of confidence in the Royal Supremacy being disturbed.

Lord John Russell, in his reply, told these Bishops that he could not sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what he believed to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which he believed to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice. He assumed that the "Puseyites" were at the bottom of all this stir against Dr. Hampden, and defended his appointment on the ground that it was calculated to "strengthen the Protestant character of our Church so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome." Two days after the receipt of the Prime Minister's reply, Bishop Wilberforce wrote him suggesting that, before the appointment was completed, Dr. Hampden should be required to clear himself before some competent tribunal of the suspicion of theological unsoundness under which he lay. To this suggestion Lord John Russell refused to accede, alleging that it would probably lead to interminable controversy. Meanwhile some of the clergy of the diocese of Oxford were about promoting a suit against Dr. Hampden for heterodoxy, under the impression that his appointment could not be proceeded with until such suit were settled. The letters of request sanctioning the commencement of a suit in the Arches Court were signed by Bishop Wilberforce on December 16th. In signing them he understood that he was not committing himself to any opinion of his own on the merits of the case, but was simply acting ministerially. No sooner, however, had he done this than, anxious, if possible, to avoid the suit, he induced its promoters to withdraw the letters of request until he should have endeavoured to obtain from Dr. Hampden some satisfactory assurance as to the points objected to in his writings. He accordingly wrote at once to the Doctor asking him to withdraw the suspected language, "*not because you admit its unsoundness, but because it appears unsound to your Bishop, and, with him, to a large proportion of the Church.*" He further asked him to affirm certain doctrines which his language had been supposed to deny, and to withdraw the *Bampton Lectures* and the *Observations on Dissent*. Enclosing a copy of this letter to Lord John Russell, he expressed the hope that he (Lord John) would intimate to Dr. Hampden a wish that he would make the required concession, one, as he describes it, implying no "*conscious error either now or heretofore,*" and "*no retraction of*

doctrine." To this Lord John Russell very naturally replied: "How is such a man to be interrogated upon articles framed, not by the Church, but by one of its Bishops, as if he were himself a young student in divinity?" and as to asking him to withdraw his Lectures and Pamphlet on Dissent, that "appears to me to require that Dr. Hampden should degrade himself in the eyes of all men for the sake of a mitre." Dr. Hampden's reply being deemed equally unsatisfactory, there seemed nothing for it but that the suit should proceed. Meanwhile the anxious Bishop set himself to re-read the Lectures, with the result, as he says, of finding that there was "little if anything really objectionable in the *intention* of the writer, though *very much in his language.*" Hitherto he had acted under the impression that he had no choice but to sign the letters of request in this suit, that if he refused he could be legally compelled to do so. Now, however, he discovered that he had the right to refuse if he saw good, and that his signing the said "letters" implied his concurrence in the charges. The result was that he withdrew the "letters of request" and published a long letter of explanation. This brought down upon him a storm of reproaches from both sides, and a crushing letter from the Bishop of Exeter. Certainly throughout the whole controversy, Bishop Wilberforce does not appear to advantage. He gives one the impression of being anxious to do his duty, but at the same time suffering his views of what was his duty to be influenced, unconsciously no doubt, by a painful foreboding of certain ill consequences to himself if he should be obliged to persist in a course opposed to the Government and especially to the Court.

Looking back over this most interesting volume we cannot forbear expressing our satisfaction that we have such an instalment of the Life of a man who, perhaps, more than any of his contemporaries, assisted in promoting that revival of energy in the Anglican Church which is still proceeding, and which, if only it be attended, as God grant it may, with a commensurate revival of real spiritual force and growing fidelity to pure Gospel truth, will make that Church, to an extent it has never yet reached, a source of richest blessing to this land and, indeed, "a praise in the earth."

- ART. IV.—1. *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*. By THOMAS of Elmham, formerly Monk and Treasurer of that Foundation. Edited by CHARLES HARDWICK, M.A., Fellow of St. Catherine's Hall, and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. Record Publications.
2. *Annales Cambriæ*. Edited by the REV. JOHN WILLIAMS AB ITHEL, M.A. Record Publications.
3. *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*. By ARTHUR P. STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: John Murray. 1872.
4. *Chapters of Early English Church History*. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1878.
5. *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. By W. F. HOOK, D.D. Volume I. Anglo-Saxon Period. London: Richard Bentley. 1860.

It has been the pleasure of historians more than once to comment upon the five great landings which appear amongst the events that mark off the epochs of English history. More important, perhaps, than any of the others was the one which took place in the year 597, and which led ultimately to the reunion of England with the Continental nations, as an integral part of the great family that for centuries looked for paternal counsel and help to Rome. The importance of that event has, however, often been misunderstood, and occasionally greatly exaggerated. It was not the first introduction of our forefathers to Christianity. Nor does it justify the ascription in any strict sense of the title of "Apostle of England" either to Augustine or to Gregory. The earliest evangelisation of our country must be dated three or four centuries previously, and the Oriental character of its liturgy and Church usages combines with its evident submission to Gallican influence to show that the Gospel came at first to Britain from the East through Gaul. When, moreover, the Saxon invasion had so far succeeded as to have established Saxon rule over all the land south of the Humber

and east of the Axe and the Severn, the subsequent substitution of Christianity for the worship of Woden was due in part to the mission that Gregory despatched from Rome, but principally to the zeal of the Celtic Church in its Scotie community at Hy. It is sufficient honour for Augustine that he commenced the work of bridging over the chasm that was cutting off Britain from the family of nations, and the British Church from the family of Christendom. And if the names of Aidan and Finan have become obscure by the side of his, it is chiefly because he was connected closely with the centre of the nations and of the world, whilst they lived and died in a remote corner and under the suspicion of heresy. A mistress will preserve the fame of a docile servant, while she permits the greater worth of the less obedient to be forgotten.

But not only is the nature of the work accomplished by the Gregorian mission frequently misstated, the preparation of the Saxon people to receive the mission is also generally overlooked and sometimes denied. Undoubtedly the Saxon inroads were as truculent as they were vigorous. The Britons, in spite of their Christianity, are described by their own historian (Gildas, *Hist.* 19) as incapable of either gentleness or truth. Deception was amongst them as great and general a vice as amongst Hindoos in the worst days of Hindooism. Ruthless cruelty to all outside the clan was the very badge of patriotism. And although such descriptions need to be qualified by reason of what is known concerning the character and purposes of their author, there can be no doubt that after the first short truce the Britons replied to the ferocity of their enemies with a ferocity that was less open but more spiteful and insatiable, and that they thereby drew down upon themselves the worst of the calamities from the face of which they had to flee. And because of this utter resistance on the part of the Britons, and of their proud refusal to submit to that incorporation with the Saxons, which took place more or less in Gaul and Sicily, in Italy and Spain,* the Saxon invasion assumed a character of rage and blood-thirstiness which nowhere else marked it. Bede, referring chiefly to a period half a century earlier than the reign of Ethelbert, writes (i. 15): "The priests were everywhere slain before the altar; the prelates and the people, without

* Southey, *Book of the Church*, p. 13.

any respect of persons, were destroyed with fire and sword; nor was there any to bury those who had been thus cruelly slaughtered. Some of the miserable remainder, being taken in the mountains, were butchered in heaps. Others, spent with hunger, submitted themselves to the enemy for food, being destined to undergo perpetual servitude if they were not killed upon the spot; some with sorrowful hearts fled beyond the seas." And Gildas, even though he keeps his strongest declamation for the vices of his countrymen, can hardly record the woes from which they suffered without adopting the imprecations of the Psalms of the Captivity. But after all that can be said about Saxon fury, it is evident that it did not go to the length of extermination. It is true that many sought refuge from it in Cornwall and Wales, in Armorica and perhaps in Holland, and that many perished pitiably in their own land. But no policy could have been more suicidal than that of actual depopulation. The Saxons were, probably without exception, soldiers; and their supply of artisans, of husbandmen, of household servants, could be derived from no other source than that of the conquered inhabitants. And unless, as is unlikely, they brought wives of their own nation with them, intermarriage with British women would speedily follow, for the universal respect of Teutons for female virtue would discourage any general practice of concubinage. And the influence of the Christian slave-wife would tend directly to the softening of the rough heart of the warrior and to its susceptibility to Christian truth. In all other lands the Saxons had soon been found ready to embrace Christianity. That readiness was delayed in Britain by the necessity of retaining their conquests by continuous wars. But as soon as ever the subjection of the Britons became anything like complete, and internal matters of establishment and faith could receive attention, it is safe to conclude that the familiar wish for the Christian religion would show itself, and the days of Woden and Thor were numbered. And there is a phrase in one of Gregory's letters, written in 596 to the young King Theodebert of Austrasia, which leads in another way to the same conclusion. Gregory is endeavouring to secure the protection of Queen Brunehaut and her sons for the monks during their journey through France; and in explanation of the journey he writes:*

[* *Ep.* vi. 58.—"Atque ideo pervenit ad nos Anglorum gentem ad fidem
VOL. LIV. NO. CVIII. B B

"It has been reported to us that through the mercy of God, the English nation eagerly desire to be converted to the Christian faith, but that the clergy in their neighbourhood neglect them and take no steps to encourage their good wishes."

In addition to this general preparation for Christianity amongst the Anglo-Saxons, there was a special preparation in Ethelbert's Jutish kingdom of Kent. To the throne of that kingdom he had succeeded as the heir of the "Aescingas" in about the year 560. It was exactly the period at which a noticeable change took place in the relationships of the various Saxon provinces. The Britons had been "so far subdued that there was no longer any general danger from their hostility" (Sh. Turner, iii. 5); and the effect of the prosperity and increasing population and strength of the different Saxon settlements led soon to prolonged struggles with one another for supremacy. To the impatient and turbulent youth of Ethelbert the commencement of this new series of wars must be ascribed. At the age of sixteen he ventured, in 568, to attack Ceawlin, the powerful king of Wessex, but was defeated at Wimbledon, and in all probability had to submit to the subjection which he had sought to impose. But such was the force of his character and the benefit of his early reverses that he managed, after the death of Ceawlin in 591, to secure the Bretwaldadom by unknown means for himself. And when Augustine met him in Thanet, he was no longer a petty chieftain without power to protect whomsoever he would, but his authority was acknowledged as far north as the Humber, and as far west as the Severn. This Saxon prince, contrary to the almost universal custom of his nation, had allied himself in marriage with the royal house of France, hoping thereby to consolidate his power. At a date which cannot be determined with accuracy, but was probably later than 589, he took to wife Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris. Christianity had already been professed at the Parisian court for more than a century; and, before Bertha was allowed to leave her home, Ethelbert had assented to the stipulation that his wife should enjoy undisturbed the exercise of her own religion and the ministry of a bishop. And thus for seven or eight years

Christianam Deo miserante desideranter velle converti, sed sacerdotes e vicino negligere, et desideria eorum cessare sua adhortatione succendere."

before the landing of Augustine there had been a Christian church and congregation at Canterbury. "On the east of the city," as Bede tells us, where now stands the church of St. Martin, there stood then a little chapel, in which, centuries before, the British Christians had met for their worship, dedicated to the same saint, and not altogether without influence upon the heathen around it. That influence cannot, however, have been more than very little. Twenty-five years later, Bertha's own son, Eadbald, was still unbaptised and a pagan. And the chaplain, Bishop Liudhard, is so purely a mere name in history, that no single deed of his can be confidently referred to, and the dispute still rages whether his original see was Senlis or Soissons. Beyond a certain respect for Christianity and disposition to favour it which Ethelbert must have learnt from his queen, and perhaps also that curiosity which has sometimes proved the mother of toleration, the small establishment at St. Martin's appears to have done nothing towards the evangelisation of the people. But that they prepared the king and the tribe to receive kindly the mission from Gregory, and almost, indeed, to welcome it, is a fact which ought not to be forgotten in any account of the reintroduction of Christianity into England, and which shows the injustice of the reproaches that have too often been heaped upon Bertha and Liudhard. If Gregory afterwards thought that the queen deserved some slight rebuke (*Ep.* xii. 29) for her apparent negligence, he at the same time so mingled therewith his compliments upon her success, that the extent of her blame is very doubtful. She would not be likely to forget, or fail to be stimulated by, the example of her great ancestress Clotilda; and in every century, the Christianity of the wife and household has been a powerful element in the conversion of pagan men.

Into a country thus prepared for his mission, and to a king thus ready to listen to him, Augustine and his companions came soon after Easter in the year 597. The incidents of their journey through France, and its romantic origin in the slave-market at Rome, are too familiar to need repetition. There are, however, few subjects in early Church history concerning which we have less information, or concerning which information would be more interesting to Englishmen, than the previous life, training, and career of St. Augustine and of the more eminent of his associates.

Almost all that is known of him belongs to the eight years between his selection by Gregory and his death. Of the former part of his life, everything, with two slight exceptions, is not merely doubtful or obscure, but a complete blank. Felix, Bishop of Messina, consulted Gregory on the degrees of consanguinity lawful in marriage, and several similar matters, and in a reply (*Ep.* xiv. 17), attributed to Gregory, but probably spurious, Augustine is referred to as a pupil of Felix. In the monastery which Gregory founded in 575 upon his estate on the Cœlian hill, and dedicated to St. Andrew, Augustine, at the time of his appointment to the leadership of the English mission, was *præpositus*, or prior. It is evident that the former of these facts is hardly reliable; but even if it were fully established, our ignorance of Felix would prevent any use of it as an indication of the training which Augustine received from him. Something, however, may be inferred from his connection with the monastery of St. Andrew. For Gregory the Great, although he wrote the *Life of Benedict of Nursia* and extolled his rule, did not introduce it into his own cloister at Rome. Moreover, the Benedictine rule, fertile above all others as it afterwards proved in works of literary research and of almost incomparable scholarship, owed its direction towards that end to the reforms of Benedict of Aniane rather than to the original constitution of Benedict of Nursia. In the beginning it exalted labour above study, and therefore, in all likelihood, it was that Gregory avoided it in his own foundation. His purpose was to create priests and missionaries, not monks and cloister scholars; and the effect of Augustine's long residence at St. Andrew's would be to make him, in the sense of the words as they might be used towards the close of the sixth century, well read, but only in the Scriptures (Gregory's well-known opposition to all ancient and secular literature would effectually exclude that from his cloister), and well equipped for the work of the ministry. Gregory, who was a judge of men, and much experienced in practical affairs, would not have chosen Augustine as his prior had he not, too, possessed some natural insight into character. An elderly man, of some dignity and learning, skilful in the control of others, thoroughly imbued with the principles of obedience, safe to overcome any difficulties that he had overcome before, but apt to be alarmed at novelties, and not without other weaknesses and defects that subsequent

events disclosed—such was the man, probably the most suitable man he could find, whom Gregory appointed abbot and father of the little band that was to win the Jutes to Christianity.

Of Augustine's companions, the names of one or two can be recovered: Laurence the Presbyter, and Peter the Monk, and Honorius the Chorister, who had learnt at the feet of the master Gregory himself, and who looked for assistance in his mission-choir chiefly to Jacob the Deacon. Both Laurence and Honorius afterwards occupied the see of Augustine; but with the exception of the latter, and perhaps of one or two others who were chosen because of their voices, the mission appears to have consisted of men already past middle age. Indeed, so soon did the necessity of strengthening it arise, that in 601 Gregory sent four picked men, three of whom seem at once to have pushed themselves to the front, and to have exceeded the zeal of their predecessors. Rufinianus, indeed, as soon as he reached Canterbury, dropped out of history; but of his colleagues, Mellitus and Justus were quickly appointed bishops of London and Rochester, and each in his turn, after many hardships, sat in the archiepiscopal chair; whilst Paulinus consecrated his prime to missionary labours in Northumbria, which have been deservedly called prodigious, and, when driven thence by persecution, spent his old age in more tranquil work in Kent under the protection of King Eadbald.

For four places the credit is claimed of first receiving this little mission from Rome. Stonar, however, near Sandwich, cannot have been the site of the landing, because in 597 it was either an insignificant island, or altogether covered by the sea. The spot marked in the ordnance survey and called the Boarded Groin is excluded for similar reasons. Retesborough was the scene of the final debarkation on the mainland, but not of the original landing, which Bede repeatedly says took place in Thanet. And there is every reason to suppose that Augustine chose the usual landing-place in Thanet, at Ebbe's Fleet, which had witnessed already, according to tradition, the immigration of Hengist, and which was to witness that of St. Mildred and several of those of the Danes. Indeed, the impression of his footmark used to be shown upon a carefully-preserved rock, upon which he was said to have first set foot; and in later times pilgrimages were made to it,

and a little chapel was built over it. To whatsoever place it was removed thence, according to popular belief, it would fly back again to its original site. And just as elsewhere at different times sacred names and events have undergone many a transference—just as during the Crusades the footmark of Mahomet in the Mosque of Omar became the footmark of Christ, and at the present day the same impression upon Mount Sinai is attributed variously to Mahomet's mule or to Moses' dromedary—so, when the local fame of the abbess Mildred began to eclipse that of Augustine, Augustine's rock became "St. Mildred's rock" (Stanley, p. 30), by which name it was currently known for more than a thousand years.

Secure in their island retreat, with what was then the broad river Stour between them and the possible wrath of the Kentish king, messengers were at once sent to Ethelbert with the tidings that "they had come from Rome to bring him the best of all messages, which would ensure to all who received it eternal life and an endless Kingdom with the true and living God" (Bede, i. 29). The king in reply, too cautious to commit himself hastily, and too much influenced by Bertha to answer roughly, bade them remain for the present where they were, and promised to "supply them with all necessities until he should see what to do with them." Shortly after he crossed the Stour, and then, in the open air, at Ebbe's Fleet, or under the shade of a mighty oak that grew near the centre of the island, took place the interview the issue of which Gregory's wisdom had foreseen. And yet it was an interview the difficulties of which can hardly be exaggerated. On the one side was suspicion, and on the other a tendency to arrogance which, if not now controlled, would spoil everything. For the king, a believer in spells and witchcraft, would not enter beneath a roof that covered the monk, lest there should be cast over him the charm of some terrible magic. And, moreover, the language of each was unknown to the other, and there was no other method of communication than the tedious and lifeless one of interpretation. For the abbot could speak no tongue except a degenerate Latin, and the king could speak no tongue except a German that was in the process of change. But such was the character of the king, and, it ought perhaps to be added, the thoroughness of the drilling which the abbot had received from his master, that all these hin-

drances to the success of their meeting were quickly overcome. And as Ethelbert and his "gesiths" or household thanes sat waiting beneath the oak, they witnessed such a spectacle as had never been seen in England before. Some forty men, clad in unfamiliar monkish garb, marched up from the shore in procession. First came two vergers, the one bearing aloft a large silver cross, and the other a board on which was painted and gilded a picture of the Christ. Like Saul amongst the people, "from his shoulders and upward higher than any,"* Augustine followed at the head of the mission. And as they drew nearer, Honorius and the Deacon Jacob and their attendant choir chanted to Gregorian music one of those solemn litanies which they had lately learnt at Rome. The interest of the Saxon king and court would be awakened at once; and forthwith with royal courtesy Ethelbert motioned to Augustine and his company to seat themselves, and the interview began. Although we have no record of Augustine's words, except in the pages of a speculative chronicler long after, he must undoubtedly have spoken in some such way as Gocelin represents. Pointing to the cross and the picture, he would tell the king "how the tenderhearted Jesus by his own throes had opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers" (Gocelin, ii. 17). Some Frankish priest, whom Augustine had brought with him, would turn the words into the king's mother-tongue. And the king replied, according to Bede, whom we may safely follow here, in that politic speech, the substance of which deserves to be preserved for ever in the annals of Anglo-Saxon Christianity: "Your words and your promises are fair, but because they are new and doubtful I cannot give in to them and leave the customs which, with the whole race of the Angles, I have so long observed. But since you are strangers who have come from afar, and, as I think I have observed, wish to make us share in what you believe to be true and good, we do not mean to molest you, but shall rather take care to receive you hospitably and to give you what you need for your support. And we shall not hinder you from bringing over as many of our people as you can to your own belief." One more promise the king made, of a house in Canterbury, thereby not merely giving the mission fair play, but putting it openly in some measure under his protection, and pro-

* *Acta Sanct.*, 326; Gocelin, *Aug. Vit.*

viding every opportunity for it to show its real character and its power to make its pretensions good.

Without any needless delay, Augustine crossed the Stour to Richborough, and followed the Roman road over St. Martin's Hill to Canterbury. And as soon as the missionaries came in sight of the city, in the Ascension week of the year 597, uplifting once more the cross and the painted board, they marched in solemn procession down the hillside, chanting a litany which they had probably learnt during their stay at Lyons: "We beseech Thee, O Lord, for Thy great mercy, let Thine anger and Thy wrath be turned away from this city and from Thy holy house, for we have sinned. Alleluia." First of all the king lodged them near an old heathen temple, much frequented by his own servants, at a place called "Stable-Gate," because there they "stabled" until he had fully made up his mind how to treat them. And Bede describes their manner of life, in this trying period of uncertainty, when any the least fault or assumption of theirs might have alienated Ethelbert from them, as altogether blameless. With his pleasing respect for everything that was sincere and upright, and his firm belief in the power of real devotion to convince gainsayers, he tells us (i. 26) that they dwelt "after the primitive Church model, giving themselves up to frequent prayer, watchings and fastings; preaching to all who were within their reach, disregarding all worldly things as matters with which they had nothing to do, accepting from those whom they taught just what was necessary for livelihood, living themselves in accordance with what they taught, and with hearts prepared to suffer every adversity or even to die for that truth which they preached." It may possibly be that Bede is narrating only what he supposed the lives of these men to have been; but however much he may be drawing upon his imagination, there can be no doubt that their singlemindedness soon won the heart of the king. Daily they walked to and fro between the Stable-Gate and the Church of St. Martin, at which they were allowed to worship with the queen, and so rapidly did their influence increase that, on Whit-Sunday of the year of their landing (June 1st), just a week before the magnificent career of Columba reached its end in the monastery of Icolmkill, Ethelbert submitted to baptism, and threw the whole weight of his royal authority upon the side of the mission. A charge of undue prompti-

tude in admitting the king into the Church, might perhaps be sustained against Augustine. Of instruction in Christian doctrine there can have been practically none, unless, indeed, we are to imagine disputes with Bishop Liudhard in the early years immediately after the marriage. But those who view the connection of the baptism with the subsequent history of England, will readily condone the undue haste of the missionary. For a whole century there had been no more important baptism in Christendom, as far as its external fortunes were concerned. For just as the example of Clovis ensured the quick success of Remigius amongst the subject Franks, so Ethelbert's subjects hastened to follow the steps into the laver of baptism which had been taken by their king. And whilst Ethelbert is distinguished above most royal converts of the mediæval ages by his distinct recognition of the truth that "the service of Christ ought to be voluntary, and not by compulsion," he is said to have shown special affection to such of his people as had, like himself, embraced Christianity. It is a credit to him that in those days he did not by force carry his whole tribe along with him and impose his own adopted religion upon them. But the persistent paganism of his own son proves that the quick conversion of so many Englishmen was due rather to the life and preaching of the missionaries and to the attractiveness of the truths they preached, than to such court influence as in a more enlightened age changed the professed beliefs of many eminent men according to the daily variations in the belief of their king.

Gregory's mission had now so far succeeded that it needed at its head another dignitary than an abbot. Augustine accordingly, following his master's directions, applied at once for episcopal consecration to the head of the Gallican Church; and in the autumn of the same year received it from Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles. Bede falls into an error, which is easily accounted for by Lingard *A.-S. Church*, i. 369), in attributing this consecration to Etherius, who was the contemporary Bishop of Lyons. Undoubtedly Arles was both the civil and the ecclesiastical capital of Southern Gaul at the period; and it must have been through Vergilius that Augustine received his title, not Archbishop of Canterbury, but "*Anglorum Episcopus*," or Bishop of the English.

Upon his return he found crowds of new proselytes

awaiting him ; and Christmas Day witnessed one of those scenes which, from the days of John the Baptist to our own, have often marked the first introduction of Christianity amongst a people. In the missionary records of the present century can be found at least one instance, in the Sandwich Islands, of the baptism of converts by thousands at a time. Nine hundred years ago, almost the whole population of Kieff was baptised one day by immersion in the Dnieper. About four hundred years earlier still, ten thousand Saxons are said to have been baptised at once in the river Swale. Encrusted as the account is with legend, it may fairly be taken as historical that Augustine after his return admitted into the Church even more proselytes than before his departure. That the ten thousand entered the water in pairs, each baptising the other, and that convenient miracles happened to prevent the loss of a single convert through drowning, may be regarded as legendary additions which poetic tendency or the sense of fitness subsequently made to the story. But neither poetry nor legend is the right word to describe one inference from the event, which has found many tenacious supporters. Gocelin says (*Acta Sanct.*, p. 390) that this baptism took place in the Swale ; whence it is argued that Augustine must have laboured in Yorkshire, and that it is right to regard him as the apostle of all England. But not only is it impossible that in that age Augustine could have travelled from Arles to Yorkshire between November 16th (the date of his consecration) and December 25th, but several objections of a similar nature might be made ; whilst the existence of another so-called Swale, between Sheppey and the mainland, at the mouth of the Medway, irresistibly suggests another locality for the baptism.

Ethelbert soon showed his devotion to the infant church in his province by furnishing it with suitable places of worship. Removing his court to Reculver, he presented his wooden palace at Canterbury and an old disused British church in the neighbourhood to Augustine, who was thus provided with a home and a cathedral. Further royal donations included an ancient building outside the town, once used by the Britons as a church and more recently by the king himself as a temple, which Augustine purified and dedicated to St. Pancras, and a site of ground close by, upon which the bishop proceeded to build the monastery that was afterwards called by his own name.

Very little is known about the mission for the next three years. In the spring of 598 Augustine sent Laurence and Peter to Rome, to carry to Gregory the tidings of their success, and to obtain his solution of certain difficulties that were submitted to him; and from some cause or other, Gregory's reply did not reach Augustine until the close of the year 601. But it is easy to picture the proceedings at Canterbury in that interval. The supervision of the abbey that was building, the instruction of the converts, whose ignorance of Christianity was exceeded only by their eagerness to embrace it, and the consolidation and extension of the little church in Kent amongst a barbarous and pagan people, would tax all the energies of Augustine and his colleagues, and leave them little time either for dulness or for the evangelisation of other tribes. Moreover, Gregory's long delay to communicate with them will surprise no one who is familiar with his habits and with his times. He was perhaps the busiest and most active of all the men who have occupied his seat: whilst the times were anxious and critical beyond most. And either this great pressure of work, which involved him as the virtual ruler of Rome in ceaseless correspondence with almost all the world, and which was concerned alike with the maintenance of discipline, the reformation of psalmody, the defence of the truth, and the relationships of the most distant nations, or else perhaps the difficulty of finding suitable recruits for the English mission, made some interval between the reception of Augustine's letter and the despatch of his answer unavoidable. Much time too would be lost in the slow and tedious double journey between Canterbury and Rome, with the many occasional days of rest that Laurence and Peter would be tempted to spend in the monasteries by the way.

At last, however, with four companions and many letters and presents of relics and vestments, they rejoined Augustine at Canterbury. The longest and most important letter was the reply to Augustine's questions, and it throws so much light upon his character and the condition of his work that it must not be hurriedly overlooked. Several of the difficulties that beset the new bishop of the English were so trifling, that Gregory can hardly have heard them without some suspicion of the unfitness of his agent being awakened. It is quite possible, indeed, that much difference of opinion may have existed in Canterbury

as to the right mode of distributing the contributions of the converts. One council* shortly before had suggested a triple division, assigning nothing to the poor; and another council soon after had excluded the bishop from any share in the offerings of his flock. Gregory first of all lays down the principle that the best scheme of partition is that which devotes a fourth severally to the bishop, to the clergy, to the poor, and to the maintenance and repair of the fabric of the church. But, continues the pontiff, that principle needs modification at Canterbury. Augustine was a monk as well as a bishop, and therefore would require no separate provision; and in his see a triple distribution of offerings was to be recommended.

Another matter troubled the mind of the bishop. He was a travelled man, and had noticed that the liturgy of Central Gaul differed from that of Southern Gaul, and the latter from that of Rome: how did Gregory account for the existence of all these variations, and would it not be advisable to suppress the Gallican litany in St. Martin's church, notwithstanding Bertha's attachment to it, and to introduce the Roman? Gregory, apart from his position, was a great authority in all liturgical questions. He had established a school for instruction in church music; he had enlarged the range of permissible ecclesiastical melody, and had instituted the Septiform litany, and revised the *Sacramentary* of Pope Gelasius. Yet his reply to Augustine bespeaks a liberality of mind and an absence of the spirit of insistency upon small particulars, the very reverse of the disposition which his studies are supposed to foster. "Things," he writes, "are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of the good things they contain." Accordingly, Augustine had better not adhere closely to the use of any single church. Let him select out of the Roman and Gallican and any other liturgies whatever appeared to him the best, and, collecting it together, form therewith the liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church. He was to be guided in his choice neither by antiquity nor by any desire after uniformity, but solely by appropriateness to place and people, and, therefore, by tendency to edification.

Other parts of Gregory's letter may be summarised

* Bright, p. 56, Note 2.—Council of Braga, in 563, had made the triple division: cf. Mansi, ix. 778. The next Council of Braga forbade the bishop to receive the third part: Mansi, ix. 839.

briefly. Theft from a church must be punished, never vindictively, but with due allowance for the strength of the temptation and a proper distinction of motives. Two brothers might marry two sisters who were not by blood relationship near akin to them; but the pagan custom of marrying a widowed stepmother must be strenuously opposed, and communion refused to those who declined to abandon such a union. Marriage must not be contracted within the third degree. Gregory afterwards (*Ep.* xiv. 17) indicated that the laxness of this regulation was due to the youth of the English mission, and that he intended in time to make it more stringent by substituting the sixth for the third degree. Further, the consecration of a bishop-elect by a single bishop was valid and sometimes unavoidable, but, whenever possible, three or four should take part in it. And finally, if we omit one matter the nature of which precludes reference to it, Augustine was forbidden to assume any authority over the Gallican Church or to interfere with the ancient rights of the metropolitan of Arles, whilst on the other hand all the British bishops were entrusted to his care and subordinated to his jurisdiction. The letter can scarcely fail to impress a reader with a conviction of a certain helplessness on the part of Augustine. He omits to ask such questions as in his hopeful prospect at Canterbury would have suggested themselves to any one who could see beyond the pettiest trivialities of the present. He asks instead such questions as betoken, on the one hand grievous inexperience, and on the other too great concern for the vindication of the position he had won and of the honours he was beginning to wear.

But this was only one of many letters which Gregory wrote at or about the same time in connection with the English mission. A second (*Ep.* xi. 28), separated from the first probably because designed for the more private benefit of Augustine, was a warning against spiritual elation on account of the miracles that were popularly attributed to him. We have already met with two of these supposed miracles in conjunction with the baptism at the Swale. And though we have no contemporary account of any of the deeds that seemed to Augustine and his companions wonders, and the later traditions are suspicious, some because of their grotesqueness, and all because of the length of the interval between the occurrence and the nar-

ration of it, yet it is obvious that some things really did happen which were believed to be miraculous. For Augustine was not a likely man to impose upon Gregory, nor Gregory a likely man to be imposed upon. And whatever explanation we may be disposed to give, there can be no doubt that Laurence and Peter reported to Gregory certain events, inexplicable by them and which seemed inexplicable to him, as attendant upon the preaching of Augustine. How far those events were of a supernatural character it is impossible now to say. There were strange doings in France, when the Jansenists were pressed by their adversaries and almost in despair. And the history of John Wesley's labours is not without incidents the natural explanation of which it is hard to find. Moreover, as Dr. Arnold reminds us, "there is no strong *à priori* improbability in the occurrence of some miracles during the first labours of missionaries in a barbarous country." If then we turn from the attempt to ascertain how far, if at all, miracles were wrought by Augustine as impracticable, we can without any similar hesitancy admire the kindly and wise tone of the letter which they prompted Gregory to write. After reminding Augustine of Christ's address to the Seventy when they expressed to Him their wonder at the power they had been enabled to wield, and after deducing certain inferences that are commonplace now but were novel and unblunted then, he shows how such gifts tend to cherish in their possessor the vices of self-confidence and pride, when they ought to be treated chiefly as a summons to deeper self-scrutiny. One of Gregory's constant occupations was the inditing of letters to all sorts of correspondents on the subject of their personal religious difficulties. And whilst this communication to Augustine suggests that Laurence and Peter had faithfully related his successes and their dangerous influence upon a character such as his, it explains also the dominancy which Gregory during his whole life exercised over so many minds. His knowledge of men led him neither to cynical contempt nor to proud chastisement of their weaknesses, but clothed all its rebukes and conveyed all its warnings in words the tenderness of which is almost greater than their fitness and wisdom.

And even these two letters did not exhaust the assistance that Gregory gave his mission. But in addition to the letter that dealt with Augustine's difficulties and the pas-

toral duties of himself and his companions, and the one that was meant seemingly for the bishop's personal profit, a third (*Ep.* xi. 65) was sent, containing a proposed scheme of church organisation. In his sanguine vision the old pontiff, from whose heart no subsequent fortunes or cares had driven the love for Britain which the sight of the slave-boys in the Roman market had first awakened, sees a near future when two metropolitans, one at London and the other at York, should each preside over a province of twelve diocesan sees. But so gradual has been the formation of the English Church, that it was not until the time of Henry VIII. that the number of two dozen bishops was reached; whilst in almost every other respect Gregory's plan, unsurpassable in symmetry, has proved irreducible to fact. He evidently intended to fix the primacy in London and York alternately: Ethelbert, and events which retarded the conversion of London, fixed it at Canterbury. In 735 York became the metropolis of the northern dioceses, and again and again it claimed the alternate primacy, until Theobald ruled at Canterbury and secured the honour permanently for his own see. And with this letter came such gifts as would be useful in connection with the establishment of ecclesiastical ordinances in the different cities—church furniture and vestments, altar cloths and vessels, with various relics and many manuscripts. But it is one of the griefs of an ecclesiastical antiquary that, with perhaps two exceptions, the mere names of these *libri Gregoriani* cannot be confidently recovered. The manuscript copy of the Gospels in the Bodleian, which has often been claimed as Gregory's, must be dated at least fifty years later; whilst only the one in the library of Corpus Christi can with probability be accepted (Bright, p. 68) as a "veritable relic of this benefaction." But the present from Gregory that Augustine would be likely to value most highly was that of a pall. It was merely the old square-shaped garment that philosophers wore in some coarse material over the tunic, then embellished and embroidered into a suitable covering for emperors, and subsequently presented by popes to their provincial representatives as a fit emblem of their dignity. But in the time of Gregory it was not altogether what it afterwards became, but was chiefly a mark of favour, rarely withheld from metropolitans, but often conferred upon any prelates of special eminence or ability. Augustine was

to wear it as a sign at once of Gregory's affection and of his own authority, but only when he celebrated the mass; and, the donor added paternally, he was to be careful that it did not feed his self-complacency. One other sentence in the letter must be referred to, because of its bearing upon a matter in which Augustine was soon to be concerned. Gregory emphatically repeats the statement of his first epistle, that all the bishops of Britain were put under the jurisdiction of Augustine, in order that, he writes, "by your language and life they may learn the rule of believing rightly and living well, and thus fulfil their office and attain the heavenly kingdom."

But Laurence and Peter were the bearers of many other letters than these three to Augustine. At least eleven Gallic bishops and four royal personages * were requested to ensure or to assist the swift passage of the emissaries through Gaul. Ethelbert is exhorted (*Ep.* xi. 66) to persevere in his new faith and to exert himself vigorously for the extirpation of heathenism, and is bidden, seeing that the end of the world is close at hand, to secure the advantage of Augustine's prayers. And Queen Bertha is complimented (*Ep.* xi. 29) upon her faith and her knowledge of letters, urged to use the latter in aid of her husband, and congratulated because, a second Helena, she had converted her adopted people. Laden with all these letters and presents, and accompanied by the four men who were to reinforce their little band, Laurence and Peter started homeward. But before many days had elapsed, Gregory appears to have reconsidered part of his advice and to have wished to modify it. At once he seems to have despatched a swift messenger, bidding him overtake the travellers and deliver to Mellitus the letter with which he was charged, and the contents of which Mellitus was to communicate to Augustine. Amongst the various modes of extirpating heathenism which he had recommended to Ethelbert, one was the destruction of the heathen temples and the prohibition of heathen festivals. Now he advises that the temples should not be destroyed, but cleansed and used for the purposes of Christian worship; and that the festivals should not be prohibited, but adapted and glorified into Christian celebrations. Two questions arise, the one relating to Gregory's meaning and the other to the policy

* Theodoric, Theodebert, Chlotair, and Brunhild.

which he advocated. It may be that Gregory did not intend the later advice to supersede the former. Milman supposes (*Lat. Christianity*, ii. 59) accordingly that he meant "to devolve the more odious duty of the total abolition of idolatry on the temporal power," and to permit "the more winning cause" to the clergy, "the protection of the hallowed places and images of the heathen from insult by consecrating them to holier uses." But Gregory's character hardly justifies such a supposition. There is no ground for the belief that he would at the same time urge one course upon the king and a directly opposite one upon the bishop. Moreover, the unsettled state of the question, in which state of unsettlement it remains still, may well have caused some fluctuation and uncertainty in Gregory's views. Councils and authoritative names could be quoted upon either side. Plea could be paralleled with plea. And it is more likely that Gregory designed, not to distribute the initiatives of destruction and transformation between the State and the Church, but to correct his first opinion by a more mature one, and to throw his weight upon the side of moderation and compromise.

But the policy of Gregory's instruction is more questionable than its motive. In his letter he does not shrink from applying the principle to every detail. The people, he writes, have been accustomed to kill oxen for sacrifice; let them be slain now to furnish feasts for themselves and the poor. They have been accustomed to religious revelry and sports in honour of the gods; let them build their wooden booths upon some saint's day, and "cull out a holiday" then. Nor does he fail to defend his recommendation: "for hard and rough minds it is (he says) impossible to cut away abruptly all their old customs; he who would climb to a height must do it step by step, and cannot jump the whole way at once." Undoubtedly Gregory's advice looks reasonable and kind, and much can be said in its favour. Church music, for example, is none the worse for having borrowed some of its harmonies from the world. And there is no idolatry in calling the first day of the week Sunday, though the name is redolent of paganism. But on the other hand the heathen taint often inheres like the blood-stain which "all great Neptune's ocean" could not wash from Macbeth's hand. And if sometimes a little Christian leaven has leavened a huge lump of heathenism, it has often lost its leavening power.

Mediæval councils had generally to devote no small part of their time to the prohibition of abuses which this policy of adaptation caused, and its effect, both then and in more recent missionary experience, has most often been either to adulterate Christianity beyond easy recognition, or to superficialise it into a comparatively useless factor in life. When the operation of the policy is confined within very narrow limits and watched with the utmost vigilance, little mischief may proceed. But even then attachment to Christianity will probably be but slight and precarious. The reverse policy may diminish for a time the apparent success of a mission, but the progress will be surer and the results more stable.

Strengthened by additional members and by the encouragement and plentiful advice of Gregory, Christmas of the year 601 must have been a season of much peace and hopefulness to the missionaries at Canterbury. They had succeeded already beyond every expectation. The king was heartily, and the majority of the thanes and people professedly, with them. Their abbey, stately enough according to the architecture of England in those days, was rapidly rising. And before them seemed to lie easy entrance into the other Saxon provinces under the influence of the Bretwalda, and a rapid diffusion of the Gospel throughout the land. Nor would the approaching conflict with the small remnant of the persecuted British Church be regarded with much anxiety as to its issue. Everything shows that Augustine anticipated their speedy submission. They already recognised the primacy of Rome. For men in their circumstances it must have appeared to him an easy step to take, to recognise its supremacy, by placing themselves under his authority and thus securing some kind of protection for their church and country.

In some such frame of mind he seems to have set himself at once to open communications with the British Church, and arrangements were soon made with the help of the Bretwalda for the safe passage of the missionaries to the confines of Wessex, where certain bishops from South Wales had been induced to meet them. It proved only a preliminary meeting, which settled nothing; but it serves to show the divergences between the British and the Roman Churches, several of which were not removed for a century. Austcliffe, on the Severn, and nearly opposite to Chepstow, is generally regarded as the locality of the con-

ference, although its situation is almost too far west. And the incidents of the interview are not such as are calculated to awaken sympathy with either party, or to exalt the character of Augustine. On the one side was the arrogance that wished to assert superiority, and upon the other the independence that was ready to ridicule and, if need be, to resist it; whilst upon both sides there was that strange tendency to attach importance to the infinitely little which disfigures the records of so many early controversies. Augustine was prepared to compromise in all points but three; but though those three were no more essential to true Christianity than the others, he was resolved to cling to them as resolutely as to the most crucial article of faith. Nor were the Britons to be allowed to decline submission to his archiepiscopal authority. They, on the other hand, have always been credited with the possession of a large degree of tenacity, and the Saxon ground upon which they stood and the Roman faces that confronted them, would arouse every particle of suspicion in their natures. By great courtesy and tenderness they might perhaps have been won, but the very position that Augustine assumed ensured his failure.

According to Bede, Augustine opened the conference with an address, in which he urged the British to co-operate with him in preaching the Gospel to the pagan Saxons, and, in order to that purpose, to enter into "terms of catholic peace." He proceeded to notice several respects in which the British Church deviated from general usage, and, singling out three of them, insisted upon their alteration. And it is indisputable that the British Church, whose missionary zeal in those early centuries was unrivalled by that of any other, had grievously neglected the Saxons. So far Augustine's complaint can be easily substantiated; their own historian, Gildas, can be quoted in support of it. But there is no more groundless charge than the one which has been deduced from Augustine's words, that the British Church was characterised by general apathy to the spiritual good of surrounding peoples. Not only did Ireland receive its first knowledge of Christianity from the Breton Palladius, but Patrick's companions were chiefly Britons; and when afterwards religion there decayed, it was revived again through the influence of the men whom St. David and St. Cadoc sent from Wales. Columba, a son of the British Church, was

the first missionary to the Picts and the first pastor of the Scots; and it was from his monastery that Christianity afterwards spread southward over England, when nothing was left of the work of the Gregorian mission outside of Kent. Boniface, too, the apostle of Germany, was born at Crediton and trained by the monks at Exeter. And if the British Church neglected the evangelisation of the Saxon octarchy, it was not because that Church was destitute of enterprise and loyalty, nor because, as Bede maliciously supposes (i. 22 and ii. 20), the spirit of revenge in it was mightier than the spirit of devotion, but because the difficulties of Christian work by Britons amongst Saxons were insurmountable. For the landing of Augustine occurred too soon after the pacification of the central part of the island to leave time for any distinct attempt at its evangelisation on the part of the British Church. And so merciless was the policy of the Saxons that even in the eighth century, and again in the eleventh, any Welshman found west of Offa's Dyke was legally punishable by mutilation. Missionary enterprise across the Welsh marches was impossible during the whole period that it was needed. And yet so insatiable was the British appetite for such work, that in the course of time it overcame all difficulties and poured a flood of Christian benefit over England indirectly through the channel of its daughter-establishments in the north.

The differences between the British and the Roman usages cannot be all distinguished, although the researches of recent antiquaries have done something towards their discovery. The British Liturgy would undoubtedly at first be similar to, if not the same as, that in use at Lyons and Vienne, and therefore founded upon the Ephesine; but gradually in the course of years variations would give it a character of its own. Such peculiarities as a multiplicity of collects in the ritual of the mass, the anointing of the hands at ordination, the consecration of bishops by a single bishop and of monasteries by the mere residence of their founder, are known to have prevailed. There are also indications of the existence of a Latin version of the Scriptures in Britain, distinct from the Vulgate and from the old Latin that preceded it. But the only differences upon which Augustine laid stress, were those in connection with the celebration of Easter, with the ritual of baptism, and with the mode of tonsure. First and principally, the

British Church, although through her representatives at the Council of Arles* she had consented to the observance of Easter on the day fixed by the Bishop of Rome, refrained or refused to follow in the wake of Rome when in 527 the Dionysian cycle was substituted for the Victorian. In consequence, though the Britons were not Quarto-decimans,† they were almost equally offensive to Rome through their adherence to an obsolete and incorrect cycle, and through their inclusion of the fourteenth and fifteenth days of the moon amongst those on which Easter Sunday might fall. It was of course desirable that there should be uniformity throughout all Christendom in the time for the celebration of the greater festivals; and no doubt had Augustine taken the trouble of showing the Britons the inaccuracy of the calculations upon which they relied, they would have yielded. As it was, he seems to have adopted another mode of argument; and the divergence continued until the year 809.

It is impossible to say with certainty in what respect the British baptismal rites differed from those of Rome. Conjecture has been busy with the question, and its favourite conclusion is that Roman usage was that of triple immersion and the British that of single. But Gregory distinctly permitted (*Ep.* i. 41) either rite: he speaks of the latter as a setting forth of the unity of the Godhead, and of the former as symbolising the Trinity of Persons. And ever since the fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) the legitimacy of either practice has been maintained alike by canon and by writers of authority.

The third peculiarity referred to the prevalent fashion of wearing the hair. There were then three principal modes amongst ecclesiastics. The Greek tonsure was complete, and its origin was attributed (Bede, iv. 1) to St. Paul. The Roman tonsure was "coronal," an imitation of the crown of thorns, of which St. Peter was the alleged author. But another tonsure, general wherever the influence of the Celtic Church predominated, was ascribed by its enemies variously to Simon Magus, and to the swineherd of the pagan king (Laeghaire), who opposed the

* The first canon of this council (A.D. 314) reads:—"Primo loco de observatione Paschae Dominici, ut uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem a nobis observetur, et juxta consuetudinem literas ad omnes tu (Episcopus Romanus) dirigas."

† The Britons made a point of keeping Easter on a Sunday.

mission of Patrick. The head was shaved on the top (*ab aure ad aurem*) from ear to ear, but the hair of the occiput was left untouched.

Such matters can only with difficulty be conceived as forming the subjects of a long and impassioned discussion between Augustine and the British bishops. But either as pretexts designed to conceal the claim to supremacy which the one was disposed to assert and the others to resist, or else with that conviction of their utter importance and essentiality which finds frequent and vigorous expression in Bede, they were in turn assailed and defended with equal obstinacy. From remonstrance Augustine proceeded to wrath, and from wrath to denunciation, each change rendering the inflexibility of his opponents only the more rigid. At last, wearied with the disputation, he ventured to appeal to God for a miracle to show which party was in the right. "Let us pray God," he said, according to Bede (ii. 2), "who maketh men to dwell together in unity in the Father's house, that He vouchsafe to signify by signs from heaven which tradition is to be followed. Let a sick man be brought, and let *his* faith and practice be followed, in answer to whose prayer the man shall be healed." The Britons are represented as reluctantly consenting; whereupon a blind Anglo-Saxon was produced, whom they failed to cure. Augustine prayed, and "immediately the blind man received his sight." The whole story may be dismissed as an interpolation. No reference to any such event was made at the subsequent conference, whilst the first one seems fitly to close with the failure of Augustine's last resource of rebuke. Bede derived his information about Canterbury largely from the tradition of old men (Bede, "*Præf.*"); and the hundred years which elapsed between the composition of his history and the incidents themselves, provides an ample time for the creation of many embellishments. The interview appears to have terminated with just this small measure of success on the part of Augustine, that he secured the appointment of a second interview, at which the British Church was to be more largely represented. The British bishops may be supposed to have readily complied with such a request. They were few in number, of a nation that was grievously vexed, and in the presence of an emissary from that Rome whose greatness still inspired awe and whose power to protect was not always ineffec-

tually wielded. They may well have been glad to escape the responsibility of finally rejecting an alliance from which, however unwelcome from other reasons, much might be hoped. To refer the matter to another conference was just the most natural thing for them to do.

Without any great lapse of time, in the same year and probably at the same place, Augustine was met by seven bishops and a number of learned men from the great monastery at Bangor Iscoed, possibly in attendance upon their abbot Dunod. But none of these men can be clearly identified. Dunod is at the best a very shadowy personage in history, and if he was alive at the time of the meeting at Augustine's oak he would be in extreme old age. His famous answer must for several reasons be treated as apocryphal—the work of some mediæval Welsh antiquary, who thereby indicated his own views of what the reply would in all probability be. The British prelates would most likely be those of St. David's, Llandabarn, St. Asaph, and Bangor, with three more from South Wales whose sees cannot now be determined. Before reaching Austcliffe, they had consulted an anchorite, who was famed as much for his discretion as for his piety. His advice was that they should yield their own traditions and acknowledge Augustine as their metropolitan, "if he showed himself a man of God." In further conversation they were told to judge his devotion to God, according as his manner was meek or harsh. And the hermit provided them with this test of meekness. "So contrive," he said, "that he arrives at the place of meeting before you. If, when you approach, he rise to meet you, accede to his proposals: if he does not rise, but treats you contemptuously, let him be condemned by you." Augustine did not rise, but refused to show the courtesy which he had himself received from Ethelbert. The suspicious Britons at once prepared themselves to contradict and reject him, arguing amongst one another that "if he did not rise to greet them when they were his equals, he would be still more overbearing were they to take any oath of obedience." To all his concessions and demands he received but one reply, "We will do none of these things which you require, nor will we have you as our archbishop." At last he lost his temper, as he had done before: and the conference broke up amid his vehement words, "If you will not accept peace with brethren, you will have to accept war from enemies: if you

will not preach the way of life to the English, you will be punished with death by English hands." Calumny has rarely ventured to invent a falser story than the one that was once widely repeated and denied with peril, that Augustine afterwards incited Ethelfrid to the tragedy at Chester, in which, in A.D. 613, almost the whole of the Bangor monks were slaughtered by the Saxons. It is a sufficient defence for Augustine that he had lain in his grave for at least eight years when that event occurred. And the most noticeable thing in his words, next to their passionate unwisdom, is rather the testimony they bear to his eagerness to evangelise the Saxons, in his grief at the refusal of the British to help him.

From the banks of the Severn, Augustine soon returned to Canterbury; and during the following year, 604, met with no such disappointments as had attended his efforts in 603. He found instead that Sabert, king of the East Saxons and nephew of Ethelbert, was kindly disposed towards Christianity. Mellitus was sent to his court, and Sabert quickly yielded to his persuasion and was baptised. Thereupon Augustine consecrated Mellitus as Bishop of London, and the foundation of a cathedral was laid upon the site where now stands St. Paul's. In Kent, too, the work of the mission had so grown that it was necessary to relieve Augustine of some of its cares; and at Rochester, Justus was installed as bishop, but with the functions of Augustine's suffragan, rather than in independent episcopal authority. And it was probably this same year also that the *Dooms* of Ethelbert were promulgated, the first of which—a national recognition of Christianity by the Witan—established a scale of penalties for wrong done to the property or to the privilege of a church. The formation of that scale, and the preparation of all needful arrangements for the new monastery at Canterbury, the walls of which were rapidly rising, were amongst the last acts of Augustine.

On May 26th, 605, he died. He had already consecrated his old friend, Laurence, as his successor, and, contrary to Gregory's scheme, had fixed the archbishopric at Canterbury. And though the contrast between the original design of his mission and its actual achievements must have saddened his last moments when the shadow of death was upon him, athwart the sadness must have streamed many a ray of joy and thankfulness, as he recalled the

good work which, by the grace of God, he had done. He had laboured as a missionary for eight years only : yet in those eight years he had rooted Christianity in Kent and planted it in Essex. Multitudes of converts honoured him as their father. Churches were being multiplied, and Christian obligations accepted. The assembly of the nation had formally legislated in behalf of his faith. And yet, without disparaging him or undervaluing his work, it is certain that the majority of the impressions, which the little that is known of him produces, are not good. Active, and stirred by a missionary zeal that neither perils of travel nor fear of man could quench, he undoubtedly was. But at the same time he possessed little of the tact and charm and self-forgetfulness, of which many greater missionaries have been made. Haughty and severe in his treatment of the British, and not without personal pride amongst his nearest associates, legend shows him to have been also quick in resentment, impatient of opposition, and unmeasured in his wrath against whomsoever he deemed discourteous. His inexperience, however, and a certain narrowness which harmonised with his arrogance, may have been due to the monastic influences under which, up to if not beyond mature life, he had lived. And sharpness of temper has not yet been an unfamiliar defect in any age. We may therefore fairly conclude that he was a man of moderate ability, good in life and intention according to the standard of his day, who, placed in circumstances of great difficulty, sometimes acted wisely and sometimes unwisely, and to whom the credit must be given of fitting the first link, which Gregory had forged, of the chain that was to reconnect Britain with the Continent and the Church of Britain with Christendom. If that union has not been without disastrous effects upon every nation that has consented to it, it was on the other hand by its help that first imperial Rome and then ecclesiastical Rome lifted the Northern races out of barbarism into civilisation, and out of idolatry into a pure religion.

ART. V.—*Ying Hai Lun ; or, Echoes from the Far Seas.*

SOME few months ago the attention of the present writer was drawn to a leader in one of the Hong Kong native papers directed against the toleration of Christianity in China, and quoting in careful detail, as precedents for a new line of departure, the suppression of the Jesuits and the checks administered to Ultramontaniam in the various states of Europe within the last few decades. Upon inquiry, the leader proved to be a plagiarism from a pamphlet published by a Chinese writer some little time ago in Shanghai, called *Ying Hai Lun ; or, Echoes from the Far Seas*. The author describes himself as "a fisherman who has dotted down a few memoranda of conversations in the library of Ignorant Wisdom." It is somewhat difficult to determine from internal evidence whether the pamphlet is a *rechauffé* of native newspapers, or whether native editors simply resort to its pages in the dull seasons when they are in special need of sparkling and savoury leaders. Whether the pamphleteer, however, is indebted to the newspaper editors, or the newspaper editors are indebted to the pamphleteer, the pamphlet itself is quite a mine of interest and amusement, abounding in curious comment on European countries and their civilisations, and unique illustrations of certain phases of thought into which a section of the Chinese mind in proximity to foreign influence is entering, and decidedly encyclopædic withal in the breadth of its native learning. The pamphlet contains more than a hundred quotations from rare and, in some cases, little known Chinese books upon almost every topic touched. The author shows such a wide and accurate acquaintance with European affairs that it is difficult to conceive how he can have fallen into some of the amusing blunders that bestud occasional pages, and one can hardly acquit him in some cases of deliberate and intentional misrepresentation. It is not improbable, however, that his ignorance is assumed, and that the wonderful lapses in his accuracy that occur now and again are designed to temper the pages more perfectly to the prejudices of the raw *literati* to whom

they are addressed as a counsel of tolerance and moderation. A learned Chinaman, with his high-wrought and voluminous, but narrow literary culture, can best be understood if we think of him as a child prodigy: there is supreme development in one direction and supreme paralysis in all others, and to the eye of worldly wisdom it may seem needful to coax and allure him by occasional fictions into an admission of the facts of the outside world. The author may possibly be applying this method in the pages before us, and may not be so ignorant or mendacious as we might imagine at first sight.

The first section of the pamphlet, which consists of a painstaking outline of universal geography, accompanied by running comments, begins, like most Chinese compositions, at the very beginning, glances in passing at the references to foreign tribes in early Chinese history, to assure the reader that the subject is not altogether in the clouds, and develops at length into a detailed and intelligent description of the various countries comprised within the four continents of the globe.

"Heaven produced men in accordance with their varying races. Before the times of the early kings, men throughout their long lives had no foreign intercourse, and the distinctions of central and outside (kingdoms) were unknown. When the Sage arose, he instituted emperors and instructors, who bound men together by social duties, rites, music, and laws, and the doctrine of humanity was established. Then arts and sciences began to flourish."

After enumerating the tribes mentioned in the earliest portions of Chinese history, the writer observes that the territory of these tribes was probably "not very far from the Middle Kingdom, and the same as that now spoken of by the honourable occidentals under the term Asia." He appends a second list of countries mentioned in Chinese history, with the remark that "these were probably on the present borders of Europe, but the transliteration of the names was haphazard; and, as the names were preserved by tradition, the sounds could only be approximate, and the historians probably introduced these names into their narratives to add to the splendour of the Imperial durbars:" a bit of free, cynical criticism quite refreshing in an imperturbable, self-satisfied Chinaman.

The early native geographers are dismissed in brief, peremptory terms, and we are told that from the time

"the Jesuit missionaries led each other on into the Middle Kingdom, the 90,000 li of the Middle Kingdom were marked into squares and counted into yards, so that the whole could spin round in the palm of one's hand. The countries of the four great quarters of the earth became accessible to each other, and the whole form of the earth could then be described." Asia has the place of honour in the writer's pages, and a careful account of its boundaries and component countries closes with the sardonic climax: "There is no meaning in the barbarian term Asia that is translatable, and there is no help for it but to use the same sound."

The Dark Continent does not seem to have taken very much hold upon the imagination of the East, and commands a very meagre notice from our Chinese geographer.

"Africa, one half of which looks towards Asia, and the other half towards Europe, is for the most part desert and unexplored. The north-east corner is near the Indian Ocean. On the Red Sea and the Mediterranean are Egypt, Nubia, and Abyssinia, all more or less akin in language and religion, and in permanent slavery to Europe."

Republican institutions command much more respect than we might expect from a Chinese Conservative, however marked the liberalism that modified his political faith.

"America, which is apart in the west of the globe, is divided into North and South. In North America there are the Americans. Amongst the smaller countries of the continent is Mexico. In South America there are Brazil, Peru, Chili, and Bolivia. The country was first established in the reign of Kien Lung. The territory is wide, the population great, the commerce prosperous, and the military strength about on a par with that of the great countries of Europe. Washington was the founder of the empire, but he did not leave the throne to his descendants. He divided the country into twenty states, each state electing representatives, who are governed by a President, who is the link between the different states. Once in four years all leave their offices, and take rank with the common people. When there are no permanent officers, a century may be passed without quarrels and contentions. The prosperity or decline of Africa and America are not dependent upon the emergencies of military frontiers.

Japan, which heads the list of Asiatic countries, comes in for more kindly treatment than might be anticipated.

The whims of the young stripling for Western tricks and toys provoke now and again a few smiles of languid contempt from its sedate neighbour and relative across the sea, and its restless hunger for territory awakens even ominous growls upon special occasions, and yet the verdict is tolerably just. Possibly the facts referred to by the author under review, that it should have kept opium and the Roman Catholics out of the country, and proved faithful to the Chinese character in spite of a temporary estrangement in favour of the Roman alphabet, will suffice to cover a multitude of political and economical sins.

"Japan is the great country of the Eastern Ocean, and from the time of the Western Han dynasty has been in communication with China. It has paid tribute continuously from the time of the Tang and Sung dynasties. The Un dynasty chastised it, but there was no fruit following (*i.e.*, the Chinese were defeated). In the Ming dynasty, however, it again presented tribute. It has rebelled several times. Now, however, complete amity prevails. The country is not very far distant from the Shán Tung, Chíl Kóng, and Fúkkien boundaries. The men of the Flowery Kingdom reach it by water, and dwell together there in separate communities. Recently Japan has taken pattern by the machinery, steamboats, railways, and military drill of Western countries, and opened mines on all sides. Its power is advancing, and it has been able to keep opium and the Roman Catholic Church out of its boundaries. Formerly it adopted European letters, but it was not convenient for the people, and it still uses the Chinese character, giving the Japanese sound in reading it. In addition there are Japanese characters which are abbreviated from the Chinese, and are current throughout the country."

A smile will be awakened by our author's description of Great Britain, and his forecast of its future. The figure of speech found in the opening sentence probably betrayed him into the attempt to reconstruct the physical geography of Scotland.

"To the north-west of western France are the three islands of London, Scotland and Ireland, resting like a tripod in the midst of the ocean, and called England. London is the capital of England. The whole extent of the three British islands, including the fifty-two counties of England, the thirty-three counties of Scotland, and the thirty-two counties of Ireland, is but equal to one of the smaller provinces of China. Its foreign possessions in the west are America, in the east, India, and in the south, the islands of the Southern Ocean. In the early years of the Ming dynasty it first

obtained possession of America, a territory of some tens of thousands of miles, and thenceforth became rich and strong. Afterwards the American people would not bear its oppressive taxation and broke out into revolt. In the fortieth year of the Emperor Kien Lung, Washington arose and cut away the southern boundaries of America and formed the United States. After eight years of bloody fighting the country was established and settled. England was scarcely able to keep the cold and desert districts of the north. The five Indies which are to the west of Burmah and the south-west of Thibet are several thousands of miles in extent. In the Ming dynasty the Dutch and Portuguese built factories for trade and monopolised the gains of the Indian Ocean. At the commencement of the present dynasty, England fought and wrested from them their commercial supremacy. In the seventeenth year of Kien Lung they raised soldiers to destroy Calcutta, and improved their victory by possessing themselves of the southern provinces. Some were destroyed and some placed themselves under the rule of the conquerors, and became little more than geographical expressions. Of those that were subjected and became tributary states, there were Nepal, Cashmere, Scindia, and Sindh that were just able to preserve their existence. The rest were all administered by England. England established four subject presidencies, Calcutta, otherwise called Bengal, Madras, Bombay and Allahabad. At the extreme limit of the Southern Ocean, England has opened up the eastern border of a great desert island called Australia, or Southern Asia, or what has been designated in popular speech the Southern Gold Mountain. The territory is isolated, about 2,000 miles in extent, waste and uninhabited. The English have commenced cultivating it, but have not subdued above a tenth part at present. There is still another island, New Zealand, in which there had not been a single footprint from the dawn of history. In the seventeenth year of the emperor Tan Kwong, the sovereign of the country, William IV., died, and his brother's daughter, who was eighteen years of age, ascended the throne. It is she who is styled the woman sovereign."

It is somewhat amusing to find those who prophesy England's political and commercial decline re-echoed in the pages before us. It may possibly nerve Mr. Gregg to patient continuance in his Jeremiads to know that he has Chinese disciples and supporters.

"The three islands of England possess very little arable land, and the treasures of the mountains and marshes are almost exhausted. If hostilities with surrounding countries should spring up England must make India its external treasury and draw upon it for military supplies. Russia is growing day by day more and more urgent for territory, and has sent missionaries of the Greek

Church into India from time to time, but the English have persecuted them. Of late years England has been very solicitous in showing kindness to India, and has recently sent the honoured minister of a titled family to regulate and pacify it. In the first year of Kwong Sü the Prince of Wales made a tour through the country to conciliate the people, and the sovereign of England assumed an imperial title, so that the titles of all the confederate countries of India might be beneath it. Possibly there may be an intention of moving the seat of Government to the East some day."

To those who foresee that the political storm which has been tossing about limbs of decayed nationalities in South-eastern Europe, and ploughing up the sands of Central Asian deserts for the last few years, will probably gyrate to Eastern Asia and fix its centre amongst interests vastly transcending the trifles under discussion at the passing moment, the views a Chinese writer may take of Russia and its possible developments will not be wanting in significance, however crude the form in which the views are stated. The writer under review, after describing the geographical boundaries of Russia, proceeds to sketch its relations with the Chinese empire.

"In the reign of Kang Hi they made trouble in our So Lun departments, and we sent a despatch to which no reply was returned. We then addressed them through the Dutch, and it was agreed to cease from hostilities and settle the boundaries. Traders were to meet in Kiachta, in Irkutsk, in the department of Siberia, and their imports were to be leather and our exports tea. Afterwards their faces were set towards the south, and in the reign of Tay Kwong they came forth from their Caucasian territories and subdued the tribes of Tartary and Bokhara, that they might have a way through Persia by which to devour India. Gradually they have been approaching the borders of Thibet, but have not yet touched them. They have constantly fought with the English on the north and south of the Snow Mountains, but have hitherto failed of victory. In the reign of Ham Fung they twice asked China for territory, the east of the Amoar river including the cities of Yiksa and Nipchü and the west of Umritzi and Tli, including the cities of Kutchah and Aksu. They subsequently took forcible possession of them. They moreover seized a suitable opportunity to annex Kashgar and Yarkand. In the tenth year of Tung Chi, they sent a powerful expedition to Khiva to open a way by Badakshan, to Cashmere in northern India, and the borders of Nepal were harassed. Recently England has wished to make Afghanistan the boundary beyond which Russian armies can-

not advance to the south, but Russia has not yet assented to the arrangement. Away to the east they have possessed themselves of Saghalien, which was Japanese territory, giving in exchange the eighteen Kurile islands. Moreover they have crossed the Eastern Ocean and cut out for themselves a section of eastern Carea, where they could get iron and coal, and have already begun to reap benefit from the acquisition. They have organised military stations along the borders of the Amoar river, and have in contemplation the establishment of a railway to China. During the two centuries they have been in intercourse with China they have entered upon no hostilities. In the reign of Kang Hi, To Li Sham, a minister of the court, visited their territory, and in his thirty-second year they sent the envoy Ishrandt Ides, who was received and entertained by our court. Afterwards Russian students dwelt in Pekin from time to time, and tribute was presented at various intervals. In the twelfth year of the emperor Tung Chi they sent Vlangalay, and in the thirteenth year Butyof, who were received at court. In the first year of the present reign they sent envoys to inquire about the tea-markets, who saw the viceroys of Shimsi and Komsuh. They avowed the firm desire of their country for permanent peace, and their country is indeed righteous and trustworthy."

The following description of French character may possibly be out of date, if all that is declared of the change it has undergone since the downfall of the Empire be true :

"France, which is divided into eighty-six departments and is some two thousand miles in extent, has recently been defeated by Prussia. Seven cities from Metz westward were taken from it for the establishment of peace. The people are very skilful in measurements and mechanical science. The greater part of the steam-engines, automatic guns, and heavy cannon have been invented by them. In accordance with their traditions they are fierce and belligerent, full of temper, fond of victory, and extraordinarily proficient in military science. The word of command is as inflexible as mountains. Ten thousand feet move together in taking one step. When those in the front have fallen, those in the rear advance to take their places without any cessation. Their weapons are superior to those of all Western countries. In the reign of the Emperor Tung Chi, Napoleon the Third commenced war with Prussia, and several years of destructive fighting followed. He was taken prisoner by Prussia. When the ruler of France was captured, Thiers and his confederates made peace with Prussia, and changed their form of government to that current in America, not appointing a king, but placing the Government in the hands of the highest minister. In the tenth year of Tung Chi,

Thiers was President, but in the twelfth year, Macmahon was substituted. Macmahon was a great officer of Napoleon the Third, and his government was benevolent. Formerly during the war with Prussia, when his soldiers were defeated, he could not die. When the Emperor was destroyed he could not save him, and moreover could step in to take his place. The people of the country still thought him virtuous."

This curious criticism on Marshal Macmahon, illustrating, as it does, a peculiar feature of Chinese morality, will not escape the attention of the most cursory English reader. According to the Chinese code of right, Macmahon ought to have committed suicide and never have allowed himself to pass to power over the fallen fortunes of his Imperial master. Of course this view rests upon the theory that the welfare of the throne is the ultimate end of all government, and that a minister's relation is to the sovereign rather than to the country. If duty is connected with two or three social or family relationships only, the sanction of duty and the reason for existence perishes with these relationships. The Chinese virtue of faithfulness, whilst oblivious of mere verbal truthfulness, is rigidly exacting in all that touches palpable relationships.

The growth of the German power within recent years has not been ignored by quiet Chinese observers, and although it can scarcely be said to have had an Eastern policy hitherto, its word commands as much respect as that of the more demonstrative European Powers. The readers of *Echoes from the Far Seas* are told that

"The eight states of Eastern and Western Prussia were originally taken out of Germany. It was inferior to France in the extent of its territory and in its military power. But the king and his ministers were active and capable, and strengthened themselves so that they were able to defeat France, and annex the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine with their seven cities. Thirty-six states are now united under the leadership of Germany, and look proudly down on surrounding countries. Russia, England, Turkey, and Austria are all troubled because of its strength, and give constant heed to maintaining amicable intercourse with it. Adjoining countries, such as Holland and Belgium, and distant countries, such as Persia, Japan, and Annam, alike court its friendship."

The rule of the Dutch in the Spice Islands does not seem to have won the esteem of the Chinese, or to have inspired any very eager desire for its continuance.

"Holland and Belgium were originally partitioned from one country. The east is Holland, with eleven departments. The west is Belgium, with nine departments. They are at times divided, and at times united. Holland is a marshy country. It is very busy in attending to distant affairs."

The writer, after recording the reverses sustained by the Dutch in their campaign against the Atchinese, sums up with an audible chuckle over the difficulties of the mother-country in keeping its colonial possessions well in hand. "All the islands under its rule have been restless, and there has been a fear lest the whip should not be long enough to reach them."

Chinese opinion would not seem to support Turkey very strongly, if the pages before us are to be accepted as any expression of it:

"Turkey was once a Khanate, and it reverences the sect of Mahomet, an Arabian. Its attitude differs from that of other Western nations. Its customs are lacking in fundamental morality, and its government is without the ties of mutual compaction. It is constantly oppressed by Russia. England, France and Germany combine to protect it. In the thirteenth year of Tung Chi its ruler was set aside because of his recklessness and debauchery, and his nephew Murad succeeded to the throne. In the second year of Kwong Sü, Murad's mind was affected, and the great ministers appointed his younger brother Hamid. The people were unsubmitive, and raised religious wars and perpetrated cruel slaughters, till neighbouring nations hated them and affairs became exceedingly critical."

The writer further says:

"Between Russia, Prussia, England and France there is a constant struggle for pre-eminence. There are some tens of small countries scattered up and down after a promiscuous fashion amongst the other countries, and all the great Powers are seeking to gobble them up and are bitterly jealous of each other, and are combined into all sorts of straight and cross formations, like the chess-board of the 'Spring and Autumn Records,' and the 'Separate States of Ancient China.'"

The geographical sections are varied by general reflections upon European character and religious faith, the justice and accuracy of which must be left for each reader to determine for himself. The following deliverance cannot but prove entertaining, however much or little of its indictment we may be prepared to admit.

"All the populations of Europe are very covetous and very brave, kings and ministers, upper and lower ranks rising at cock-crow, and incessantly fluttering about after gain. Where gain is concerned, fathers and sons and brothers do not take each other into account at all. There is no labour or hardship from which they will flee. They will exhaust the very last grain of life and strength in adding an inappreciable element to the fringe of a handicraft, or a microscopic trifle to the construction of an implement. In delicacy they seek a still more exquisite delicacy, and in skill a still more subtle skill, advancing with an undivided and all-consuming desire, and never knowing how to stop. That is the nature heaven has given them."

When the writer comes to deal with the religions of Europe, it is difficult to acquit him of deliberate dishonesty and mystification. His ecclesiastical history is a hotch-potch of the crudest things the dregs of Orangemen and Ultramontanes say of each other, with a few original blunders added by way of seasoning.

"From the time of the Ha dynasty Europe has had a remarkable man, called Moses, who established the ten commandments for the instruction of mankind. Afterwards Solomon and John expanded and handed down his teachings. In the days of the Emperor Un Shan, of the Hon dynasty, Jesus Christ was born in Rome, and when He was grown up began to preach the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. After several hundred years there was a man called Paul, who separately established the Greek Church; and there was Luther, who established the Protestant Church. The three Churches stand up against each other, and are at mutual variance, but they all worship the Lord of heaven. Russia and Greece belong to the Greek Church. England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Holland belong to the Protestant Church. France, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Spain, and Portugal belong to the Roman Catholic Church."

A short extract will serve to show the delight with which the loss of the temporal power of the Papacy is hailed in China :

"The Roman Catholic Church has a spiritual sovereign who is revered by all the other countries, especially France. The spiritual sovereign is perverse and reckless, and has constantly domieered over all the rulers of the different countries, and nobody dared resist him. But the great minister of Germany, Bismarck, dislikes him, and has taken away all his power, and restrained him by penal laws; therefore the Church is at the end of its resources in Germany. At the same time the prime minister

of Italy took away the power of the spiritual sovereign by force, and made his master ruler of the United Italian States. His merit was great. He moreover confiscated seventy-two churches, at which the adherents of the Church ground their teeth, but at last took their departure under a pretence of sickness. Thus Bismarck accomplished his will, and saw Frederick William Emperor of Germany, able to make his own selection of competent men, with no one to divide his counsels."

As an antidote to the fever for annexation that attacks European nations now and again, it might, perhaps, be well for Cabinet ministers to read, at prescribed intervals in their deliberations, a few passages in which the heroic policies of the past are delineated by neutrals. Without pronouncing upon the morality of the annexation of uncivilised by civilised Powers, such annexations are at best but necessary evils. A gain of direct influence through an annexation, however small, involves a loss of indirect influence in countries whose confidence might prove of far higher commercial and political value to us. Let the following sketch bear witness :

"Up to the time of the Ming dynasty the island kingdoms of South-Eastern Asia constantly presented tribute, and, together with the countries on the borders of the Kwang Jung and Yunnan provinces, Siam, Burmah, and Thibet were subject states of China. At length Europeans came across the seas from afar, and by heavy presents began to obtain strips of territory for wharfs and anchorages for their ships, and established markets, and preached their religions. After they had squatted for some time, and their adherents were increasing, they purloined the taxes and customs dues, and took away the powers of kings and rulers, and stripped them of their possessions, obtaining their ends by complacency, and establishing the new order without labour. At times, when there was an occasion of which they could take advantage, they harassed the populations by formidable armaments, like swift wind and thunderbolts amongst withered leaves and branches. In the course of a century the savages of the islands were almost exterminated, but Suloo, a place about as big as a pill, was preserved. It was in this way that Portugal came to occupy Hongkong(?), and Spain Manilla, and Holland the islands of Sumatra, Molucca, Batavia, and Atchin. Papua, which is a desert island, they have also commenced to open. In the reign of the Emperor Jung Chi, France invaded the province of Ha-tinh, in Annam, and the English invaded and seized Rangoon, in Burmah, and opened a trading route. All the tributary states of China have formed alliances with the countries of the West."

After referring to an attempt China is said to have made to open communication with the Romans, and the defeat of the attempt by the Parthians, and to the opening of the Suez Canal route to the East, and the purchase of the Canal shares by the English Government, the writer says :

"In the East, the English by degrees are coming to have a little more self-restraint, and have pressed China to appoint consuls in Singapore, Australia, and other places, to protect the Chinese residents, and at the same time to restrain any of their tendencies to turbulence and rebellion."

In the old Chinese maps of the world, China is made to bear about the same proportion to European countries that a huge turkey does to half a dozen unfledged, consumptive little chickens. We have changed all that. But whilst it is cheering to find from the pages before us that a more just sense of geographical perspective is beginning to dawn upon the Chinese mind, it is a somewhat grave drawback to find all the European envoys to China, from the middle ages downwards, including Lord Amherst and Lord Macartney, described as tribute-bearers, and the present body of European ministers as more immediately commissioned to edify the pride of Chinese Imperialism.

"In the fifty-eighth year of Kien Lung, the ruler of England, George the Third, sent the minister Macartney to the court of Peking. The emperor came into the 'hall of reverence and purity' to receive him. He presented twenty-eight different kinds of geographical and astronomical instruments. It happened to be the emperor's birthday, and the emperor was receiving congratulations in the azure hall. He gave presents to the foreign mission, and commanded Tsung Kwan, one of the ministers-in-waiting, to escort it to Canton. In the first year of the Emperor Ka Hing they again sent tribute, and in his twenty-first year sent the minister Amherst to court. In the midst of the reign of Tao Kwang they initiated animosity by opium, that lasted till the reign of Ham Fung. After an interval they resumed their friendship, and in the twelfth year of Tung Chi, Thomas Wade was sent to congratulate the emperor upon personally taking up the reins of government. America sent Frederick Lowe; France sent Geoffroy; Holland sent Ferguson; and Japan and Russia each sent a minister. They were received in the hall of purple light, and mutual ties with foreign nations were strengthened."

The geographical section of the book communicates an old piece of information with an archness and *naïveté* little short of charming.

"In the northern boundary of Russia is the department of A Tsin Yatkh (?), where there are men who are only three feet high, who use dogs for horses, and deer for oxen. These are the dwarfs of ancient history. In the south of South America there is the country of Patagonia, where the men are over ten feet high. These are the giants of ancient history. But, inasmuch as they have no relations with China, we will not speak of them at length."

The second chapter of the volume before us, which treats of the religions, science, literature, railways, machinery, and armaments of European nations, opens with a melodramatic description of the recent impact of European Powers upon Chinese life.

"Lo, a scene opens before us that has never been paralleled through the long years of our history. Strangers who have traversed thousands of miles, and with whom we have hitherto had no mutual acquaintance whatever, are suddenly found one fine morning squatting at the very centres of our territory, and strutting up and down in the privacy of our family apartments."

The impudent intruders are subjected to a good deal of free and not over-complimentary criticism, although spared that merciless kicking out that would be the natural complement of this aggravating metaphor in a European mind. Precedents are drawn from ancient history to justify a patient toleration of their presence.

"The Hon dynasty had fraternal relations with Shun U (the ruler of the Mongols), and made frequent treaties. The ambassadors, holding their staves of investiture, went forth in their chariots to all the four quarters of the empire, and at that time such missions were not considered a sign of humiliation or disgrace, and at last Shun himself became a tributary at our court. This is a point which the Cassandras of literature, with their salt tears and their long-drawn sighs, are unable to see. When the princes had interviews with the emperor, there were the prescribed bows and genuflexions, and the emperor addressed them as 'fathers and uncles.' And it was never even whispered that the dignity of the court was impaired thereby. And if this could be so in receiving envoys from within the borders of the empire, how much more in receiving distant men who are not under any relation to our emperor!"

The writer under review vindicates Christianity from some of the more monstrous charges that have been made against it in China, but maintains that its teachings are

nothing more than cast-off Chinese heresies. The imperturbable self-sufficiency inherent in the Chinese character will scarcely suffer the admission that even evil can come out of Nazareth, if at least the evil have any merit of originality in it.

"The Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrines have been preached in China. Gossips speak of the sorceries and incantations of these sects, and say that they cut and mutilate dead bodies for the purpose of extracting medicines from them, but it is without sound evidence. Although these rumours are propagated by thousands of mouths, there is nothing of the sort practised. I think this is scarcely worth discussing. The three Churches of Europe all spring from a common source. The ancient teachings of Mak Tik are but dressed up in the teachings of Buddhism and Mohammedanism about an all-cherishing benevolence and a self-contained righteousness, and loving all things in the universe alike, and entering into gratuitous relations with all visible existence, for the sake of conferring upon it our benefactions, whilst there are no relations of sovereign and minister, father and son, husband and wife, older and younger brother, but all are treated according to the rule of friendship, kith and kin being ignored, and complete delusion prevailing as to the doctrines of root and branch, near and distant. The expression to 'wear off the hair on one's body, from the scalp right down to the heel, for the sake of doing good to all under heaven,' is fulfilled in Jesus saving all the world by holy water and precious blood. The fire-arms (of his disciples) sweep men away, and are destructive in the last degree; but when they have taken prisoners who have not been quite killed, they proceed to doctor and nurse them. This is the virtue of the Duke Seung of Sung. Notwithstanding all this, it must be confessed that our own scholars and officials have over-estimated gain and make light of righteousness, so that in their dealings with their own flesh and blood they inexorably square accounts to the last grain of rice and the last thread of silk. They acquire a name for virtue by kindness in such little things as hoes and spades, and contend, on the other hand, about sieves and brooms; and when they have money to spare, they delight in making reputation by extensive subscriptions for the relief of the poor. Ever and anon they give their thousands and tens of thousands for the relief of the friendless, and of widows and orphans previously unknown to them, and their own relatives and former acquaintances have not the wherewithal to keep themselves from famine and starvation. Frugal where they should be generous, and generous where they should be frugal, they show their inconsistency with the Sacred Classics, and make themselves simply laughing-stocks with respect to the things that taxed the

most anxious thought of even Jao and Shun. And thus all the world comes to praise their virtue and benevolence in the most exaggerated terms. This is the sect of Mak Tik, which anciently spread in China. Now Jesus is all this on a small scale. His adherents are of the type of Pin Tseuk, Wa To, Cheung Ling, and Kan Him Chi, who are able by their skill to heal diseases, like the ancient doctors and soothsayers. The Pope has great power in Europe, like that of the Llama of the two Tibets, but of late it has been insensibly passing away; and when it entered the Middle Kingdom it became still more insignificant. The churches these people build are for the same object as the mosques of the Moslems, and the monasteries of the Buddhists. In all the provinces of China, the strangers from the other provinces build their guild-houses, where they sacrifice to the heroes of their native places, and meet together at the different festivals to make merry, and assemble for the discussion of public business. The men of the Western countries are thousands of miles away from home, and it is only human nature that they should erect in common temples where they can worship the spirits of their native country, and possess a spot where they can meet together at festivals. It is a popular custom in Western countries to snare men with gain. A few of the low people along the coast have entered the church for the sake of getting money, but we have not yet heard of men in official robes and hats, and of any of the literary classes who have demeaned themselves by entering the church."

But if, according to our Chinese author, Christianity has a very sorry prospect before it in China, Confucianism is just entering upon a very brilliant era in Europe. It would be impossible to equal the following prognostication in the most inflated reports of missionary success that have ever made the acquaintance of printer's ink. We may accept the gauge it gives us of the judicial accuracy of the writer, as a comfortable abatement of the discouragement the foregoing passages may have produced within us as to the future prospects of Christianity in China.

"Of late years many Chinese books have been translated into European languages, and there is a growing knowledge of Chinese literature. A great many schoolboys and students in England, France, Germany, Switzerland, and all the other countries, are now able to recite the Book of Odes, the Book of Changes, and the works of Confucius and Mencius, and in less than a century our doctrine ought to have spread through all Western countries. The words of "The Golden Mean" are near their fulfilment, "All who have breath shall love and honour him (Confucius)."

The writer of the present review has sometimes amused

his friends by the prediction that a century hence China will possess railways and steamboats and telegraphs, and solemnly aver that they are native inventions and that she has had them from the beginning. Judging from the following passages, the playful prediction would seem to be in a fair way for being realised.

"Throughout the whole empire all are conversing about 'Western Science.' I venture to think it is not Western Science at all. Astronomy is the system of dividing the heavens and measuring the length of day and night. How do those countries converse about these topics? They come back to the East with elements they have translated and borrowed from us. Everybody knows it. In the *Tai Tai Lai*, Tsang Tsy says: 'If it were true that the heavens were round and the earth square, the four corners could not very well be concealed.' The *Chan Pi King* says: 'The earth slants on its four sides and is like an inverted basin.' The *Lo Fui King* says: 'The primeval air became true earth after it had been worked through ten cycles. The circle was filled up and planted in the midst of the Universe.' The *Tsong Kit* says: 'The earth completes a revolution in a day and is supported on wind-wheels.' The *Shü Han Ling Ju* says: 'The earth is in constant motion, and does not rest, but man does not perceive it.' The *Un Ming Pau* of the Spring and Autumn Classic says: 'The earth revolves towards the right to meet the heavens.' When Ricci and Verhiest and the like say that the heavens are at rest and the earth is in motion, the root of it all is here. Mak Tsz says: 'The evidence of evolution is easy, as, for instance, that frogs become quails.' When earth, water and fire of the five elements are combined, metals may be smelted and water volatilised and wood transformed. Different substances may be combined if their respective weights are adjusted. When two bodies will not combine it is because they are of foreign natures. This is the beginning of chemistry. In speaking of the specific gravity of the elements and dividing them into classes, Western people speak of nitrogen, oxygen and carbon. If two hairs be cut to the same length they will sustain the same weight. If the weight attached to the one is greater than that attached to the other, it will snap because the weights are not equal. Equalise the weight attached to that which snapped and it will snap no longer. This is substantially the same as the experiment of the sovereign and the feather, spoken of by the men of the West. The enigma that one is less than two and more than five points to the science of weight. All these things are the first rudiments of dynamics. Kong Tsong Tsz says: 'When the crust is taken off from earth there is water, and when the crust is taken off from water there is air. This is the origin of pneumatics.' A Classic

says : 'The earth is full of a spiritual breath. From the spiritual breath there comes the rushing of the wind, and from the rushing of the wind form is conceived, and all things are shaped into visible embodiment. This is the origin of the Science of Electricity.' Ui Nam Tsz says : 'Manipulated earth produces wood, and manipulated wood produces fire, and manipulated fire produces cloud, and manipulated cloud produces water, and manipulated water returns to earth. Amber will attract threads, and magnetic stone draws iron.' When Europeans first began to speak of electricity they called it the air of amber, and described the earth as a great magnetic stone possessed of spontaneous electricity. The Chinese have spoken very clearly of electricity. Moreover, we have methods of drawing circles, any points in the circumferences of which are at equal distances from the centres, and of inscribing squares within circles and pyramids within cones, and of drawing triangles the sides of which shall be measured by the diameters of circles. These are the elements of trigonometry and conic sections. The writings of Ngo Chun and Jeung Ling speak of delicate and mysterious machinery for engraving and for weaving, that leaves no trace of the process in the article ; and of implements for the defence of cities and for use in fighting ships. Modern military armaments have their starting-point here. Hon Fi speaks of the skill of Mak Tik, who made a wooden bird that would fly, and an automatic cross-tree for a chariot, and an extraordinary kite. All these things may be verified by examination. The scientific men of the West have simply followed out these clues. Their appreciation of principles, their elaborate explanations, and their cunning in the practical application of knowledge cannot go beyond what is already contained in the books of the Middle Kingdom. It is very laughable when our scholars who are versed only in the classical commentaries and the histories of the different dynasties, and have not widened the field of their research and thought deeply for themselves, suddenly light upon extraordinary things, and imagine them complete novelties, and are tempted to forsake all their old learning and follow the new chase. The scholars Wong Sik Chin, Miu Man Tong, Kong Wing, and Tai Chan were able to search into recondite subjects and elucidate the reasons of nature and take the subjects that are called Western subjects, and melt them together and then explain them, and that in more refined methods than Western men. Chemistry and electricity, too, are called European science, and our scholars are ashamed because Europeans are not of the same species with us ; but when we come to know that the root of these sciences is to be found in Chinese literature, scholars ought rather to be ashamed of their ignorance on this score. The matter is simply one for the correction of names."

These attempts to assert and maintain for Chinese

literature a position of scientific solvency and even affluence, remind one of Caleb Balderstone's amusing expedients for bolstering up the reputation of the broken fortunes of Ravenswood. It is sometimes asserted that science will realise a broader freedom in association with systems of human ethics than in association with supernatural religions.

These extracts would not seem to suggest anything of the sort. Science has not set itself free from Christianity by some splendid and heroic spurt of its own strength, as "the infant Hercules strangling the serpents about its cradle" style of speech implies. Christianity has given it its manumission and enfranchisement because its own moral interests are so intense and absorbing. Confucianism, with a less inspiring and absorbing ethic, seems bent upon retaining it as its own bond-slave for ever. Till Christianity has first come to create the true scientific temper, science is impossible. Nothing but a moral regeneration can remove the self-satisfied spirit exhibited in the foregoing extracts, and make China an honest and teachable disciple in the school of science.

The following passages will show what a disaster it is that the Cross should have been preached in China as a fetish, rather than as a doctrine of redemption from sin. Those who know what degrading appeals to Chinese superstition are mixed up with some of the noble Christian writings the early Roman Catholic missionaries gave to the Chinese, will not fix all the responsibility of this wicked travesty upon the writer under review. The only remedy for these lamentable distortions is to swamp the semi-Christian superstition that makes them possible by widespread evangelical teaching.

"Western men, in speaking of instruments, say there is nothing profounder than the cross, because in the figure of it there meet one continuous and two broken lines (the diagrams for male and female elements in Chinese divination). If you draw a line round it, you have a circle; if you draw straight lines from point to point, you have a square; if you divide it by perpendicular and horizontal lines, you have angles; and if you halve it, you have two bows, or segments of a circle, which are all the implements necessary in manufacturing the furniture and vessels of common life. All the ancient writers agree that the diagrams on the back of the phoenix that arose out of the river, and the configurations on the tortoise of Lok, were in series of fives starting from the

centre, and all formed figures of crosses, but they did not explain their meanings. They contented themselves with the assertion that they were symbols of the complete form of the universe, and of the operations of fire and water, and were therefore able to repel all the baleful influences of evil incantations by which the world might be injured. The officers of the Chan dynasty, who were appointed to rule and repel the destructive insects bred in the water, when they wished to destroy the vital energy of these insects, employed a piece of blackthorn, with a piece of ivory threaded through it transversely, and placed the figure in the water. The figure was in fact that of the cross. The Hon Book of Magic calls the cross the repressing instrument (instrument for repressing baneful influences), and all the ancient witch-doctors possessed it. Jesus got hold more or less of the traditional practice, and used the cross for performing his various tricks. Schaal and Longbardi, and the like, mistakenly make it out to be an instrument of punishment; but this is the ignorant vulgarity of the men from the West. All the early witch-doctors who used occult arts invariably died violent deaths. Pin Tseule, Wa To, Chin Ping, and Fi Cheung Fong, were all of this class. That Jesus should be slain may be in accordance with this principle, but it is not necessary to hold that he suffered the most extreme punishment in being nailed to the cross."

It is, perhaps, due to the reader to state that this passage is a *bonâ fide* translation from a Chinese writer, and not an irreverent parody from the Chinese standpoint of any passage from Mr. Baron Gould's *Origin of Religious Belief*, or Mr. W. E. Tyler's *Primitive Culture*.

The invention of the European methods of writing is an honour reserved by our Chinese author for a countryman of his own. He vindicates the claim by a reference to three brothers whose names are still preserved in Chinese tradition. One wrote from left to right. This was the origin of European methods of writing. Another wrote from the right to the left. The third wrote from the top downwards. This was the origin of the Chinese method of writing. "The general appearance of European letters is like the Mongolian characters that appear in Imperial proclamations." The Chinese writer does not seem to be greatly in love with European alphabets. "Western sounds are bewilderingly multitudinous, and one word will sometimes need as many as ten characters to express it." He even ventures upon a little amateur philosophy, and his theories are, perhaps, worth neither more nor less

than those of more famous pretenders in the same direction.

"Probably at first there were only substantives in English and French composition, and afterwards they added particles, because the sentences were not smooth and flowing. Foreign countries make the sound the attendant of the character, and when the sound changes, the character changes with it. Europeans have entered China for some three hundred years only, and the Chinese sounds they have represented have become so topsy-turvy, that now it is impossible to be confident of recognising anything but the names of the most simple and elementary articles."

The writer evidently deplores the fact that he had no acquaintance with the ancient Greeks. He seems to feel that an *entente cordiale* might have been possible there, whose tender grace can never come back in these degenerate days of commercial brusqueness and ruffianism. The paragraph on European letters is suddenly interrupted by a pathetic parenthesis. "Greece was pre-eminently a country of literature, but its people have not often come to the Middle Kingdom." The paragraph closes with the following flattering declaration:

"If we take our Chinese method of piecing together the initial sound of one character and the final sound of another to represent an unknown sound for which there is no character, we may have a general idea of European letters, so that we shall not be despised by the Choctaws and Objibeways of the West, and that will suffice. We need not waste our strength and exhaust our thought in a profound pursuit of these dwarfed and pigmy characters."

Readers of commercial tendencies will turn with interest to what a Chinese writer has to say upon the subject of railways and steamboats. After giving a short history of the invention of steam and describing the spread of railway systems in Asia, the writer stops, after his usual fashion, to vindicate for ancient China an equality of inventive skill and resource with the West. The native reader would, perhaps, be scarcely able to hear of the marvels of Western science without fainting, unless his courage had been previously screwed up by a very strong dose of the ingenious and the wonderful from Chinese history. "I have examined into antiquity, and find that there was a magnetic carriage and a flying chariot, but the

method of constructing them has not been handed down." The writer poohpoohs objections raised by his fellow countrymen to railways, on the ground that they cost an immense amount of labour, and may be destroyed by the act of a single individual, and compares people who are anxious on this score to the hypochondriac of Ki, who was constantly distressing himself lest the heavens should fall. He seems to have his own shrewd objections to the introduction of railways, however, if we may judge by the following assertion. "When France was in its prosperity it was constantly constructing railways to harass Prussia, but when it was in its decline Prussia came by those very railways to punish it. Its action in constructing these railways was simply suicidal." The writer declares, with a slight accent of contempt, that

"The great countries of the West make trade the foundation of government, and merchants and traders all have a share in the administration. The Duke of Chan came to the Imperial court, and his people were contemplating giving in their allegiance to Ng and Cho. Tsz Chan said to Hon Hi, 'Your ancestors had a perpetual treaty with traders.' The spirit of the Chun Tsau times has come down to our day, and telegraphs and steamboats and railways are all established in the interests of merchandise, and armaments are maintained for the protection of traders, and the people accordingly take pleasure in them."

After this apparent sneer at shopkeeping politics and popular government, the writer goes on to desiderate for his country something after very much the same pattern, or perhaps rather to depreciate steam transit by implication, because in his view it can only consist with popular government.

"In the Middle Kingdom the power of the mandarins is separate from that of the people. There is a wide chasm between the feelings of the two classes, and no interchange of views. If the mandarins undertake the entire responsibility of establishing steamboats and machinery, and the people have no part in it, it will be an arduous task, and difficult to carry through, because the advantages will not be shared by the people at large."

The writer of the pamphlet before us makes no secret of his objection to the adoption of Western machinery in China. Some of the reasons he adduces in favour of manual labour would throw an English country squire of the old school into ecstasies.

"In Western countries all kinds of works are now carried on by steam. I have heard it stated that in the occupations by which people seek their livelihood in China, such as husbandry and the domestic industries and the various handicrafts, that the method is very roundabout and the profit very small. The ancient emperors ruled the country by making the people labour for the whole year, so that they had scarcely enough to satisfy the body. Accordingly it was said, 'If the people labour they will be thoughtful, and a virtuous heart is born of thoughtfulness.' What is meant by saying 'a man has enough if the necessities of his family are provided for' is, that it was sincerely desired that they should obtain what they had by toil, and not come to it in the way of idleness and luxury. Now in digging and weaving, and in the coal and iron industries, machinery is employed in the place of physical labour, and this is tempting men everywhere to pride and idleness and to ease in the midst of perpetual wealth. Will they not then rush continually into riotous living and luxury, and will not the millions of husbandmen in the southern fields, and miners in the northern mountains, wheelbarrow-men and boatmen with their hands horny for the rest of their lives with toil, their livelihood taken away in a day by machinery, and all hope of earning their bread lost, gather together and unite in rebellion? The machinery of Western countries has not been established for a century, and several great rebellions have occurred which not improbably had their origin in some such causes. Probably when machinery is first established, wealth can be obtained with great rapidity, but when it has been in work for some time, the stocks become excessive and prices low, and gains revert to what they were at first. Of late years the outlook for foreign merchants has become gloomier every day, and the gains of steamers and telegraphs are all less than in the days when commerce was first established. Those who have been long upon the seas all testify to this. It is a world-wide rule that ingenious and convenient things never last very long. Now the traders in all the coast provinces have tasted the profits of machinery, and some are subscribing capital to make it themselves, and some are making contracts with the foreigners for the purchase of it. If the will of the people be followed with respect to railways and steamboats and mining and weaving, the profits of the foreigners may be forthwith shared for the time being, but after the lapse of a century or more it will still be desirable to abandon these things because of the smallness of the profits. But if the agriculturists and artisans and merchants do these things by a common constraint, why should the interior provinces, that have had no intercourse with foreigners hitherto, be compelled to imitate unprecedented customs? By a moment's practice can the profits be obtained, and no legacy of poverty be left for another day."

The writer is not eager for the purchase of foreign war material, but ardently admires the discipline of Western armies, because it is after the type of military discipline current in the classical times of Chinese history.

"The great countries of the West are very skilful in drilling their soldiers, and when every step is in order, the ranks stand like mountains and move with the strength of flowing water. When one suddenly sees the majesty of these disciplined armies, they seem to be unconquerable. But in the twenty-first year of the Emperor Ka Hing, the French were defeated at the battle of Waterloo, and the English gave chase and cut off 20,000 heads. In the twenty-first year of Tao Kwong, the English were defeated at the battle of Hing To Ko Sz (Hindoo-Koosh?), and the Russians drove them back some tens of miles. In the ninth year of Tung Chi, the French were defeated at the battle of Sedan, and the Prussians took over 10,000 prisoners. When battles are fought in Europe there are inevitably fugitives rushing madly away or seeking to conceal themselves, and chariot tracks crossing each other in confusion, and drooping standards; but when they enter China they are able to march to death in unbroken file. There are two explanations of this fact. The first is that they have left their country thousands of miles behind, and they are strangers to the language and ignorant of the principles that prevail, and when there is no place of concealment for them if they are defeated, every man makes up his mind to death, and their impulse is to march on in line without ever swerving. The second explanation is that in the first and last wars with China, in the reigns of Tao Kwong and Ham Fung, the forces were withdrawn as soon as they were brought together, and, in some instances, marched back at the first roar of the guns. It was not a matter of a million of corpses left on the battlefield and blood flowing for hundreds of miles. But the men are obstinate and capable of enduring toil, and there is great singleness of purpose amongst them, princes and nobles sharing the hardships of the common soldiers. Edinburgh, a son of the sovereign of England and son-in-law of the sovereign of Russia, whose high rank may therefore be judged, commenced the life of an ordinary sailor on board the *Galatea*, and was afterwards promoted to be captain of the *Sultan*, and has recently been made a vice-admiral. There is no chance promotion in the army, therefore the upper and lower ranks have the heart of one man and can live or die together. The nations of Europe train their soldiers in accordance with the practices of our ancient times. We ought to condemn ourselves because the men of the present time are not equal to those of ancient times, and not excuse ourselves on the ground that we are not equal to Western countries."

After giving the names of the different rifles and siege guns used by the different countries of Western Europe, the writer says they are not omnipotent.

"The best Western weapons have failed at times in Europe, and failed in China too, where native weapons have succeeded. In the reign of the Emperor Tung Chi, when the Kwangtung rebels took Kin Ling, An Hing, Kew Keang, and other cities, the Imperialists employed foreign cannon in attacking them, and were not able to make any headway. Afterwards, at the siege of Kin Ling, the Chinese method of mining was employed, and the city was taken. At that time Colonel Gordon and others were with the army, and did not cease to praise the skill and prowess of our warfare. Some time ago, when there were hostilities, and the foreigners took Ningpo, Canton, and other cities, the cities did not fall through heavy cannon being directed against them."

The writer discourages costly coast defences, because foreigners have great interests at stake, and are not likely to raise unreasonable troubles with China.

"They are kept in check by their mutual jealousies, and their objects are commercial. The ancients said, 'In fighting victory is won in courts, and attacks are warded off over dishes and bottles,' which, however, is not meant to imply we may be careless about our defences. But if we refurbish our government, and put in order all matters of administration, and there are no disorders within our boundaries, the men of distant countries will not be likely to cast sinister glances at our soil. If, under these circumstances, we establish garrisons everywhere, and employ all our time in strengthening our defences, we shall resemble Tsun Sz Fi, who built city walls in places where there were no enemies."

The third section of the book deals with the objections to intercourse with foreign nations current amongst the educated classes of the Chinese who have never come into contact with Europeans. It is cast into the form of a dialogue between the writer and his friend, whom we may, perhaps, respectively characterise without, of course, any reference to English politics, as a Liberal-Conservative, and a thoroughpaced, implacable Tory of the most antiquated school. To many of our readers the remarks may seem rubbish and unworthy of translation; but, not to speak of the claims that widely-diffused commodity has to the respect of the subjects of Western Governments, the rubbish before us, in but slightly changing terms, governs the life

of a fourth of the human race. Such wonderful rubbish is entitled to a respectful hearing. To listen to a few sentences uttered at this symposium may give us as good an insight into Chinese thought and character as a dozen books on China and the Chinese that record Englishmen's opinions only.

"*Tory Guest.*—'The people on every side are full of reverence for us, and receive their model of law from our illustrious court. Are those who are separated from us by nine intervening families of languages able to assume the airs of braggarts, and butt against the Flowery Kingdom? Treacherous men have conducted our affairs with reckless pride, and determined officers have grown angry, till the welfare of our commonwealth is in a state of perilous suspense. Alas for stately China! Will there be no chattering about the condition into which she has fallen?'

"*Liberal-Conservative.*—The Treaty of Commerce provides for the envoys from foreign countries entering into the presence of our honoured emperor to pay their respects; and in the reign of Tung Chi we thrice sent ministers to foreign countries to see the sovereigns of those countries. In entering and leaving the royal presence they bowed three times, and that was all, because in visiting those countries the rules of decorum are inquired into, and what is right in common practice is followed as politeness requires. We have the ceremony of kneeling, and they follow our practice when they visit us. Prostration is not a part of their court decorum; therefore, when our envoys go to their countries, they follow the current practice, and no humiliation is inflicted.'"

It is unfortunate that the difference in the court ceremonial of Europe and the East should give any plausibility to the deliberate misrepresentation by which the Liberal-Conservative calms the agitation of his Tory guest. The author of *Echoes from the Far Seas* is doubtless well aware of the fact that, whatever the humiliations to which some of the missions in the last century submitted, the present generation has not yet seen any representative of a civilised Power on his knees before the dragon throne. This momentary aberration is followed by two or three redeeming quotations the Chinese Government might do well to inscribe on the walls of its Foreign Office.

"Siu Mong Chi said, 'When distant states come to yield their subjection to us, there is no hard and fast regulation for the form of their subjection, but it is becoming to treat them as guests rather than as vassals.' Pan Ku says, 'If we receive them re-

spectfully, the bonds between us will not be broken, and any shortcoming there may be will arise on their side, because the ancient emperors in their treatment of outside states only discussed the right and wrong of the business in hand, and did not seek to determine rank by outward ceremonies.'

"*Tory Guest.*—'Lün Tai [a Tartar chief selected as the prototype of foreigners] loved silks and the precious metals, and food and clothing are consumed in protecting foreigners, and vast stores of goods are going out of the country, and the way has been opened for the boundless rapacity of foreign merchants, and the light of the opium lamp flares in our halls, destroying the livelihood of the people, and there are distressing leakages from our present commerce with foreigners.'

"*Liberal-Conservative.*—'Under former dynasties there were annual items of expenditure in our official accounts for the entertainment of foreigners, but now these have disappeared. From the time of our commercial intercourse with foreigners, the receipts of our customs have increased every day, and have now reached more than ten millions of taels per annum, and the help to our public expenditure is not insignificant. Was the state of things under the Hon and Sung dynasties comparable to this? With respect to foreign vessels coming to our shores and lading with silks and teas and vegetable products, this extensive traffic, which has no parallel under former dynasties, is only good, and no evil is apparent therefrom. But all foreign countries are united in condemning the Indian trade in opium, which is eating into our very life. When we speak of the opium poison, which by degrees makes the industrious idle and the strong weak and the well-to-do indigent and the temperate avaricious, and will some day cause China's strength and courage to pass away, till at last it will bow its head and bend its ear in servile allegiance to others (the reason that India and the islands of the Southern Archipelago were swallowed up so easily was that they had been plied with this bait, and it was, therefore, unnecessary to use military strength for their conquest); when these things are considered, I say, all other leakages are insignificant in comparison. In reference to cultivating opium in the interior of our own country to checkmate the foreign opium, this would be supplanting cereals by poison; and upon what principle can this be justified?'

"*Tory Guest.*—'When languages differ it is difficult for mutual trust to be maintained between us in our various transactions. When tastes and passions diverge, the intellectual attitudes we respectively assume become enigmas. If the Flowery Land has intercourse with barbarians, the common people will fearsomely warn each other against the tattooed monsters. When host and guest are jealous of each other, can foreign bonzes conjure back

pleasant feeling by thrumming with their cunning fingers? The poisonous spittle of the people of Au Lung is universally dreaded amongst us, and Central Asian nationalities cover up their faces with shame (in our presence). This is a natural consequence; and how can the tendency of these antipathies be otherwise?

"Liberal-Conservative.—'The method of dealing with these distant peoples is, first, to seek out that by which they may be conciliated. They have left their countries far behind, and sincerely seek the unbroken perpetuation of prosperity, and the everlasting conservation of their gains, and have no wish whatever to invade our territory. If, on the one hand, we follow their wishes without any just ground, their arrogance will grow day by day, and if on the other hand we despise them without any reason, they will become more and more jealous and distrustful, and we shall not be able to maintain a smooth course in our diplomacy. The treaty of Hon Man Tai with Tan U says, "The heavens above us are not partial in their overspreading, nor is the earth that contains all things onesided in its bounty. I invite the two countries, as children of one family, and life shall flow in endless generations, so that (the benefits) shall reach even to birds above and fishes below, yea, even to four-footed beasts and winged fowls and insects. Nothing that exists shall be excepted from the law of peace and good, and seek refuge from danger in vain." Therefore, the stream of those who gave in their submission to him never ceased. This is the way of Heaven. The edict of the Emperor Kiun Lung, addressed to the Board of Punishments, upon the case of the English trader Jung (?), is full of just and pure sentiment, and is sound in every particular, casting light upon what is minute, so that the most distant issues are seen as if he had had a prophet's forecast of the foreign questions that were coming up a hundred years hence. The edict, after confirming the sentence of degradation passed upon certain officials, who had ignored a complaint by "a barbarian trader from England" against a Chinese debtor, proceeds to say; "It is, moreover, commanded that a copy of this utterance shall be given to the barbarian trader from England who is concerned, that he may take it back with him to his native country and manifest the compassionateness of the Chinese throne. The merchant ships of these barbarians cross vast seas for the sake of seeking gain, and we ought to be just in all our commercial dealings with them, so that they may return home contented with their gains, and that the dignity of the Middle Kingdom may be maintained. If it be found that the crafty people of our inland districts concoct fraudulent schemes to cheat them, either in money or kind, the people must be judged according to the law. But Li Chat Wing inflicted a most lenient sentence upon this offender, and left him to his own heart's counsels in discharging the debt, which is

practically passing a sentence without carrying it into effect. Providentially the Board of Punishment memorialised the throne, and I thus became acquainted with the whole history of the case and revised the sentence. It is of the first importance that the Middle Kingdom, in regulating the affairs of strangers, should hold fast to justice and uprightness, so that strangers may be moved in heart and filled with reverence and brought into harmony with right principles of life. If we account them as grass and weeds, and allow our local scoundrels to cheat and ill-treat them, and when they appeal in their distresses to our mandarins, the mandarins show themselves onesided in the protection of the people and do not follow pure doctrine, as these foreigners are unable to be present in the capital and appeal to the throne, their wrongs will inevitably be nursed within their own breasts, and they will return to their homes and spread abroad the report amongst the savages of the islands, and will not our viceroys and governors be despised and reviled and laughed at? And it is to be feared, too, that if the wickedness of the native merchants of Canton leads to vain appeals for protection, the feet of the foreign traders will be bound, and they will not come into our midst as heretofore. Moreover, my settlement of this question is not because of its intrinsic importance, but because I am troubled with deep-seated forebodings. In the declining years of the Hon, Tong, Sung and Ming dynasties, there was a sad misunderstanding of the methods of dealing with aliens. When they were weak and inactive, they were oppressed and ill-treated: but when they were become strong and there were affairs in dispute with them, these affairs had to be settled with timidity and fearfulness. Now our country is prosperous, and the vassal-states all respect our power, and do not dare to entertain any perverse sentiments respecting us. In seeking to provide against danger, it is binding on us not to fail to arrest it in its first onset. This business of the barbarian trader from England has been treated by the Viceroy and Governor as if it were a case of ordinary debt and lightly dismissed; but they are not aware how momentous are the interests involved. I wish to govern both the Middle Kingdom and the Outside States by the same principle of benevolence. When the Tsikhars first gave in their submission their rank was low, but I treated them all as though they were my own grandchildren, so that at every visit they danced for joy, and I made no difference between them and the vassal chiefs of the Mongols and the Manchus. And when the annual messengers come from the newly-acquired dependency of the Sunnes, I bind them with kindness and extend to them courtesy, and make their presents bountiful and send them away on their return, so that there is not one who does not carry with him a welcome recollection of my favour in the same way as the

Tsikhars, as all my ministers can testify. In reference to the trade in horses, carried on with Ili and Kashgar, it must be regulated according to right principles. If the horses from Kashgar are not all good, they may be chosen and bought according to their values; if they are serviceable animals, prices must be given according to their values, and permanent trade will be established. If the silks given in exchange are made thin in texture and light in weight and their values secretly diminished, so that what is received as an export does not equal what is given in exchange as an import, inasmuch as the trade with Kashgar is of long standing and the traders know what they ought to receive, although they may betray no expression of what they feel, will their minds be at rest? If the established customs for carrying out the trade be transgressed, the evils that will ensue will have no ending. I shall be obliged to require explanations from the General in office, and shall not be able to endure his mismanagement any longer, should these matters be allowed to drift day after day from bad to worse, and no amendment is apparent.””

Shall we be trespassing upon politics if we point out that some recent proclamations issued by British generals in the name of Her British Majesty bear a curious resemblance to the Emperor Kien Lung's "goody" edict about the barbarian trader Jung (?), and the horse-fairs of Ili and Kashgar?

“*Tory Guest.*—‘I have still difficulties about these questions. Confucius assailed strange doctrines, and Mencius repelled heretical teachings, and when the two heresiarchs Jeung Chii and Mak Tik arose, he resisted them with unexampled energy. When foreign doctrines are spreading, how can they be checked but by controversy?’

“*Liberal-Conservative.*—‘The ten commandments of Moses are not of the same insidious character as the discourses of Lai Kan, and Jesus, and Paul, and Luther, but extended the meaning of the ten commandments, and founded the sects of the Western countries. Ü Kün says the sacrifice to heaven has given rise to the name “Lord of Heaven.” The name originated in China, and spread to the Tartars, and through them became current in Western countries, and was thus probably first used by Jesus. The ministers in the last years of the Ming dynasty delighted in conversing about Western learning, and loved to associate with those who had been across the seas; but would not degrade themselves to discuss Western religions. At the commencement of the present dynasty there were the cases of the perverts Li Tso Pak and So I Kam. Yeung Kwong was the

first to be incensed at their course, and, having memorialised, the throne was instrumental in bringing Tso Pak to punishment. His conduct in this affair was very meritorious. Those who now disseminate Western religions have not the adroitness or the accomplishments of Schall and Ricci, and those who become converts have not the wealth and standing of Fu I Chan and Un On Shan, and there is no necessity to oppose the propaganda. But the mischief of the perverse teachings of Yeung Chü and Mak Tik was that scholars were affected by them, and Buddhism even obstructed the Government, extending its power over sovereigns and prime ministers, so that in the course of several centuries the names of Mak Tik and Confucius were coupled together; and there were some who assumed the garb of priests to learn the doctrines of Buddha, and gave up their lives to meditation. It was right under these circumstances to openly repel heresies. But are the churches now able to lead astray our high ministers, officials, and scholars? Their adherents are only restless, unsettled people, who have lost relation with their clans. I have learnt to distinguish between what is orthodox and what heterodox very clearly from a reverent perusal of the edict of the Emperor Yung Ching respecting Buddha's birthday. On the eighth day of the fourth month of the fifth year of Jung Ching's reign the nine Cabinet ministers were addressed in the following terms:—"To-day is the day for celebrating the birth of Maitreya Buddha, and by chance, at the same time, the envoys from the countries, if the West present their despatches of congratulation. The two things just coincide, and I will, therefore, take the time usually occupied in replying to memorials in making known my wishes. Hitherto the Tanists and Buddhists have exerted their utmost powers of speech in traducing the religions of Western countries, and the men of Western countries have spoken against Buddhism in no less degree, and there have been mutual recriminations and charges and counter-charges of heresy. According to the type of wisdom possessed by these parties, what is in agreement with one's own views is orthodox, and what is at variance with them is heterodox, not what the sage meant when he spoke of heresy. When Confucius spoke of opposing heresies, he meant what was hurtful and nothing more. Did Confucius condemn as heresy everything that was not in accordance with his own views? If any of the doctrines established in China or Western countries are practised in an improper way so as to prove hurtful to social morality, or to the state of the individual mind, that is heresy. For instance, the men of the West worship the Lord of Heaven. Now Heaven created all things by the male and female principles, and the five elements, and it is therefore said the source of all things is Heaven. This is the Lord. From ancient times and downwards has there ever been a man

who did not reverence Heaven, or who did not reverence the teaching of Heaven? And what difference is there between this and the reverence paid to Heaven in the religion of the West? But if it be said that Heaven came down to earth and became incarnate in a human body to save and guide men, this is boastful and presumptuous language, and the term Heaven is simply employed to delude the fanatical and the ignorant, and to lead them into the foreign sect. This is the heresy of Western countries. I suppose that the founder of Western sects was a man very much revered and trusted in his own country, and was possibly honoured in the same way as Heaven; but if it be said that the man who founded this religion gave himself the title of Lord of Heaven, this is a thing for which there is no warrant in sound doctrine. Buddha accounted stillness and inaction essentials, and the manifestation of the true nature by purifying the heart to be a merit. Nothing can be more excellent than this. But when the duties between minister and sovereign become obscured, and the affection between father and son forgotten, and the relations of society set aside that all may reach the stillness of Nirvana; and, moreover, there are empty teachings about blessing and disaster, and the common people are deceived, and hollow professions to Buddhistic sanctity are made, and asylum is afforded to vile, lawless men: this is the heresy in Buddhism. If our scholars observe the ways of the early kings, and study the writings of the sages, all the people will accept them as their models. But if the Sacred Books are used only as implements for obtaining literary rank, and the examinations are regarded as paths by which reputation may be spread abroad, and there are men who rely on evil and pernicious words to catch the popular ear, and use cunning and voluptuous compositions to debase the popular mind, this is the heresy of the Confucian school. With respect to magicians and doctors, although Confucius did not altogether set them aside, still they are not very far removed from heresy. But magicians are employed in connection with sacrifices to the spirits and doctors in healing our ailments, so they cannot very well be dispensed with. But magic and medicine pass into heresy when the rustic magician tempts people into evil, and the doctor tampers with human life. Can we altogether set aside the use of medicine because of the occasional heresies into which doctors run? And more than this. Each vessel and article of daily use is prepared for a fixed end. When it is placed in a sphere to which it is not suited, or so injured that its original form is gone, it becomes heresy—an alien thing. The same thing may be right or wrong, truth or error. Right and truth are correct doctrine; wrong and error the contradictories of correct doctrine, *i.e.*, heresies. Therefore, what we seek in our investigations is right or wrong,

truth or error, and not the mere indication of agreement with or divergence from ourselves. The aim of all the religions that have been established in China or Western countries, without exception, is to make faithfulness to sovereigns, the filial love of parents, the esteem of virtue, the reprobation of vice, the suppression of adultery and murder, the nurture of the true nature and the rectification of the disposition, supreme ends, and the founders of these religions were naturally not men of an everyday level, but had much that was remarkable about them, and were therefore able to make men receive and practise the religions they founded. But their later disciples added to their teachings, and amplified in every direction, so that endless traditions, for which there was no rational basis, sprang up, and heresies were formed. But how can these religions be held responsible? China has its own religions, and Western countries have theirs, and there is no reason why Western religions should prevail in China, just as there is no reason why Chinese religions should prevail in the West. But when men like So No and U I Chan rebel against their ancestors, and put themselves in opposition to the court, and gratuitously rush upon punishment without any pity for themselves, is it not astonishing? The doctrine of the men of the West respecting the incarnation of Heaven's Lord is excessively extravagant and rational. Heaven's Lord rules from the midst of universal mystery; and what mortal reason is there why He should become incarnate in a world of men? If it be said that those who enter the Church of Rome are the after-body of Heaven's Lord, why should a man who wears the clothes of Yas and chants his words be an after-body of that emperor? All this is the climax of pertinacious irrationality and boastful falsehood. Western men are skilled in mathematics, and our Government has engaged their services. For several decades we have been at peace with Western men, and we must not be oblivious of the virtues they possess. The Mongols reverence the Buddhist faith, and follow its teachings; therefore if it is wicked to exercise control over the Mongols, the religion of the Lamas must not be lightly set aside. Those who do not know all this have their doubts and misgivings about the Imperial policy, but they are shortsighted and narrow in their views. The sum of the matter is, people at large have no sense of justice and no clear conception of what true doctrine is, accounting what agrees with their own views right, and what varies from it wrong, and levelling slanders and recriminations against each other as though they were foes. The varying dispositions of men cannot be brought to one standard. They have been trained upon different plans, and can neither be forced into agreement or disagreement with ourselves. Moreover, all have their excellences, and all have their shortcomings, and whilst we see and avoid their short-

comings, we must not be forgetful of their excellences; then there will be mutual peace, and every man will have his use, and the lucid and equitable and comprehensive views of the early kings and emperors will be followed, and we shall have a world of universal 'concord.'""

It will be a surprise to the Western reader to find a passage in this latitudinarian edict approving the persecution of Chinese Catholics. Such anomalies, however, are not altogether unprecedented in the history of the world at large.

"Tory Guest.—'But I have further difficulties. In Roman Catholic countries, the Order of the Rose always gives rise to bloodshed, and the heavy fragrance of the poppy is fatal to the life of the populations of our own soil. There cannot but be indignation at the lives Roman Catholics have sacrificed in open day, and at the reflection that their holy water should be tinged with blood. It is an occasion of universal heartburning that the noxious vapours should be puffed in the best hours of the daylight, and that opium demons should be gliding hither and thither in gleams of green. The insinuating influences seduce on every side, and universal life loses its vitality and is depressed. One man cries out, and the people at large behold till their angry eyes burst the corners of their eyelids. The wrong done to humanity is great indeed. How can the evil be repressed by law or dissipated by mere talking.'

"Liberal-Conservative.—'The only countries that trade in opium and disseminate religion are England and France, other countries being altogether free from these things. England and France depend upon their gunboats and firearms to bully our local mandarins, thinking that thus they will be able to keep the people down, but they do not know that the temper of our people cannot be kept down by force. Our people cannot distinguish between the different nationalities of the West, and look upon all nationalities in the same way. Of late years, whenever France or England has had any matter of dispute with us, the merchants of a score different nationalities in the coast-ports have all been agitated by the possibility of unforeseen troubles. This is not only a source of great sorrow to China, but to the friendly countries of the West, and an immense injury to the common cause of commerce. I truly wish that there may be perpetual peace between China and Western countries, and that an international congress could be called to exhort England not to trade in opium, and France not to disseminate religion, so that Western traders may receive kinder treatment, and the obligations of commerce be more strictly kept.'

"Tory Guest."—'I have further objections to urge. The book on *Obscure Contingencies* makes the power of confederating different nations the highest proof of talent, and the power of punishing neighbouring Powers the proudest triumph of military science. Thus when Hong Kii had become a dependency of the Hon dynasty, the emperor straightaway cut off Chi Chi's head; and, when Tai Un had entered into friendly relations with us, we broke the arm of one of the Tartar rulers by way of climax. To inveigle enemies and sow division amongst them is one of the most skilful plans in war. Your discourse is not up to the standard on this point, and steers somewhat wide of the whole question of finesse.'

"Liberal-Conservative."—'The government of a country rests upon the virtue of the individual. I can constrain myself; why should I be compelled by others? I can be faithful and trustworthy for myself; why should I betray others by unfaithfulness? This task of marshalling tigers against wolves, and teaching monkeys to climb trees, is a thing that the better sort of people don't exactly approve.'

"Tory Guest."—'I am not yet satisfied. Confucius condemned Un Man, and Mencius praised Yas and Shun. We must display our virtues and compel ourselves to compass what is difficult in the service of the throne. The ancients have left to us illustrious lessons.'

"Liberal-Conservative."—'The people of the Hon dynasty had a saying, "Small matters need not be treated of as if they were as high as the skies, but our actions must be adjusted to what we can see." When we speak of the splendour of the ancient durbar at the To mountain, and the majestic display of military power at the Pan springs, and of feudatories from Burmah and the country of the white pheasant standing in our dazzling courts, and the various Tartar chiefs allied to our mighty throne, is not the style of speech a little too high for the subject, and rather hollow and lacking in practical import? I have read an edict of the Emperor Shun Chi, which says, "Every one who fills the office of a state minister ought to prize genuine results and not hanker after empty reputation. Those who hanker after reputation will be very arrogant in ostensible action, and pliable and wavering in the actual policy they pursue. If all cherish the desire for reputation, upon whom can the affairs of the government be devolved? Is it not the very climax of faithlessness when the weal or woe of the empire is accounted a matter of no more moment to the ministers than the corpulence or lankiness of the men of U1 was to the men of Tsun, and does not disturb their thought in the least?" Good indeed. Ought not those who take the work of critics upon themselves to know what pattern they ought to imitate?'

"Tory Guest.—'Agriculture is the highest of industrial pursuits. Those who labour in the fields would blush to draw their conversation from books of commerce, and though profoundly wise seem stupid and ignorant in outward bearing. The guileless blush to use such ingenious contrivances as the weighted dipping beam in drawing water from the well. Therefore, the gimcracks brought to us by merchants from afar, and the articles of useless ingenuity produced by our own workmen at home, are amongst the flimsiest of vulgar fashions.'

"Liberal-Conservative.—'The *Record of the Inspection of the Technical Industries of the Chan Dynasty* says: "There were six degrees of rank in the state. Mechanics and merchants were of equal standing with the great ministers of the Cabinet. In the time of the three earliest dynasties, those who were able to make useful vessels and instruments were invested with offices that descended to their remotest heirs, or received an additional name derived from their manufactures." The ancients never refused to openly recognise the technical arts.'

We will close our extracts from this dialogue between the old- and new-school Chinaman with the following passage, in which the Tory guest follows up his burst of bucolic idealism by a piece of rash and heated denunciation, and at last retires in apparent dudgeon from the scene.

"Tory Guest.—'But this is not all. The woman Ue She founded a female dynasty. I find by inquiry, that in the reign of Pat Kong, of the Ha dynasty, Ninus was King of Babylon, and he was succeeded by his wife Semiramis. She was the first of female sovereigns. Distinguished men amongst the Romans were the first to allow the establishment of democracies. The Greeks worshipped Jupiter as the guardian spirit of their countries, and elected Archons by a vote of the majority, who ruled the country, and were changed once in three years. Now America and France follow this practice and are called republican countries. The profiles of women that are cast on their gold coins, the honour extended to the female sex, the limited extent to which capital punishment is carried into effect, are all points in which their customs have scarcely changed from of old. With their deep-set eyes and their bushy beards, their stern, forbidding faces, their love of grape wine and milk, their skill in trade, and their eagerness about odds and ends, they have remained unchanged for three thousand years. Why, in speaking about Western countries, should we seek for further evidence than this?'

"Liberal-Conservative.—'What you say is capital. In speaking of Western countries no writer is more complete than Pan Fan,

and in discoursing of the affairs of our frontiers, no one surpasses Mang Kin in clearness. And Tang Suk, of the Sung dynasty, says : "The skill of the foreign barbarians is shown in the conciseness of their books, and because of this their thought moves rapidly." It is a calamity of the Middle Kingdom that the composition should be so laboured. Thought moves slowly in consequence. In former times laws were severe and orders prompt, business concise, and officials pure. They did not take twists and turns, and bring in irrelevant matters in settling rewards and punishments. But in these more degenerate times a despatch is handed in to-day and a postscript to-morrow, and there are endless hair-splittings lest the thing should not be quite clear. The only merit of this style of despatch is that it increases labour, and the only virtue of this roundabout administration is that it is slow. Therefore, in speaking of Western subjects, few words are better than many words, and no words at all better than few words.'

"The guest was silent and went away."

The author does not tell us whether the finale of the symposium is meant to signify that he expects his party will shortly be left in possession of the field. If this is to be the case, we hope he will employ the interval in taking an additional lesson or two from his old preceptors. It would be a pity for the capacity his comments sometimes exhibit, despite the national prejudice with which they are leavened, to be lost for the want of a few finishing touches.

ART. VI.—*The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.*
By DR. GERHARD UHLHORN. Edited and Translated
by EGBERT C. SMYTH and C. J. H. ROPES. London:
Sampson Low, Marston, and Co.

It is a fascinating subject which Dr. Uhlhorn has chosen in the above work, and he has treated it in a fascinating manner. So far as we know, the early triumph of Christianity has never been made the subject of express treatment before. The student has had to form his own idea of the course and issue of the conflict from details scattered over a wide field. Here for the first time the details are collected and grouped in order. A very thrilling story it is. We see an old world, an old order of society, of thought and faith and worship, breaking up and passing away, and a new order rising on the ruins. A mighty gulf, scarcely to be measured, divides the modern from the ancient world. The points in common are few. No one can read the poets, historians, and philosophers of antiquity without feeling that they belong to an altogether different system of things. The cause of the difference undoubtedly is Christianity. The transition was not made without conflict, and it took three centuries to effect. The time can scarcely be considered long in view of the magnitude of the issues involved. Let it be noted that the change was effected and the victory won wholly by private, voluntary effort. No state or party stood forth as the champion of Christianity. When the State became Christian the issue was already decided, the victory already won. It is the process of this transition which the author of the above work pictures in a very graphic way. The most recent researches into ancient life are laid under contribution, while the illustrative material is chosen and arranged with the greatest skill.

After illustrating the preparatory mission of the Roman empire and the Jewish religion, the author proceeds at once to describe the combatants who were to contend for the mastery of the world—heathenism on one hand, Christianity on the other. One effect of such a description is to dispel the notion that when Christianity appeared

heathenism was already dead. The centuries of struggle which were necessary, the persecutions to which Christianity was exposed, the many attempts to bring about a revival of heathenism, alone should refute this. But it is difficult for us to realise that the system which to us is mere mythology was a living power when the apostles began their work. Yet this must be realised to some extent before we can appreciate the triumph of Christianity. Whatever Christianity is to us to-day, that paganism was to ancient Rome and Greece. It is true that heathenism had proved its insufficiency to meet the needs of human nature. It gave no answer to the questions men were asking respecting themselves, the future and God. Faith was declining, especially among the higher classes. But paganism still held sway over the masses, and was supported on social and political grounds by many who had mentally broken loose from it. If Romans and Greeks could no longer believe in the gods as their fathers did, they knew of nothing better to put in the place of the existing system. The utterances of uncertainty and despair on the lips of the more thoughtful and earnest are very touching. As immortality seemed to recede more and more into cloudland, men clung to the present life with greater tenacity. The reason why the graves so often lined the public roads, was the semblance of fellowship thus preserved between the world of shade and the world of warm life and sunshine. Suicide was commended. "Seest thou," exclaimed Seneca, "yon steep height? Thence is the descent to freedom. Seest thou yon sea, yon river, yon well? Freedom sits there in the depths. Seest thou yon low, withered tree? There freedom hangs. Seest thou thy neck, thy throat, thy heart? They are ways of escape from bondage." The shortest life was declared the happiest, and the happiest lot of all was not to be born.

Another prominent feature of the heathen world was its great religiousness. The phrase by which Paul described the Athenians, "too religious," might be applied to the whole of heathenism. There cannot be a greater mistake than to charge the heathens either of the past or present with the absence or neglect of religion. One of the strongest impressions left by the reading of such histories as Grote's, Mommsen's, Arnold's, is the conspicuous place filled by religion in the life of the Greeks and Romans. This impression is fully confirmed by the present author's

account of ancient heathenism. There was no department of life, public or private, which was not interpenetrated with religion. Church and State were thoroughly blended, not to say identified. "All the States of antiquity had a theocratic foundation. As national life was everywhere interwoven with religion, so the religious life was a part of the political." "At every important public transaction the gods were consulted, sacrifices offered, and religious rites observed; every assembly of the people was opened with prayer. Augustus made an express decree that every senator, before he took his place, should go to the altar of the deity in whose temple the assembly was held, and offer a libation, and strew incense. Down even to the last days of the Republic it was the looking up to the ancestral deities which inspired the army. When before a battle Pompey spoke to his soldiers of the art of war, they remained unmoved; but when Cato reminded them of the *dii patrii* (though himself without faith in them), he inflamed the whole army, and the battle was a victory. And as the entire State, so also every community, every city, every circle of cities, had its special cult, well-founded institutions, rich and distinguished colleges for priests, and special feast-days and sacrifices. Every province, every city, every village, honoured with local rites its protecting divinity, and everywhere the various religious observances were most intimately connected with the civil constitution of the community, and sustained by local patriotism. In the same way all domestic and family life had a religious tone. Each period of life, every important event, was celebrated with religious services. Though the names of the different deities who are mentioned as presiding over domestic life designate rather functions of the deity than divine beings conceived of as having independent existence, yet these very names afford proof of what has just been stated. There was the goddess Lucina, who watched over the birth of a child; Candelifera, in whose honour at such a time candles were lighted; Rumina, who attended to its nursing; Nundina, invoked on the ninth day, when the name was given; Potina and Educa, who accustomed it to food and drink. The day when the child first stepped upon the ground was consecrated to Statina; Abeona taught it to walk, Farinus to lisp, Locutinus to talk; Cunina averted from it the evil enchantments lying in the cradle. There was a god of the door (Forculus), a god of

the threshold (Limentinus), a goddess of the hinges (Cardea). There was a god for the blind (Cæculus), a goddess for the childless (Orbana). 'Even the brothels,' exclaims Tertullian, 'and cookshops, and prisons have their gods.' Every household festival was at the same time a divine service; each class had its god whom it invoked, and from whom it expected help and protection in its work. From a niche of a rafter, Epona, the goddess of horses, looked down upon the stable; on the ship stood the image of Neptune; the merchants prayed to Mercury for successful bargains. All tillage of the soil began with prayer. Before harvest a pig was sacrificed to Ceres, and the labour of felling a forest was not commenced until pardon had been supplicated from the unknown gods who might inhabit it."

In Rome the union of the secular and sacred was symbolised in the person of the emperor, who was *ex officio Pontifex Maximus*, and as such celebrated the chief sacrifices. But the culmination was reached in that deification of the living emperors, which more than anything else precipitated the conflict between the Christian Church and the Imperial power. For such deification much might be said from the old heathen standpoint. If dead heroes might be worshipped, why not living ones? As to moral character, were Nero and Caligula much worse than Jupiter, or than the new god of collective Humanity worshipped by Positivists! At the same time the heathen conscience did revolt somewhat at the thought of such deities near at hand. And accordingly we are told that the Imperial cult flourished most in the provinces, where less was known of the emperors. In this case, ignorance was the mother of devotion. The worship of the emperor was the one universal worship of the empire. In it religion and patriotism met. The snare involved in this practice for Christians is obvious; to comply was idolatry, to refuse, treason. Enemies of the Christians everywhere insisted on the custom as a test. The story of the three Hebrew confessors was repeated on a vaster scale. "The judicial proceedings against the Christians, as these fall under our notice in numerous acts of the martyrs, always become decisive at this point, the refusal of the accused to pay divine honour to the emperor. 'You ought to love our princes,' said the proconsul to the martyr Achatius—to give merely a single instance of thousands—'as behoves a man

who lives under the laws of the Roman empire.' Achatius answered, 'By whom is the emperor more loved than by the Christians? We supplicate for him unceasingly a long life, a just government of his peoples, a peaceful reign, prosperity for the army and the whole world.' 'Good,' replied the proconsul, 'but in order to prove your obedience, sacrifice with us to his honour.' Upon this Achatius explained: 'I pray to God for my emperor, but a sacrifice neither should he require nor we pay. Who may offer Divine honour to a man?' Upon this declaration he was sentenced to death."

Another feature of heathenism, old and new, is the complete separation between religion and morality. A religious profession was quite compatible with personal wickedness. The nation did not become more moral as it became more religious. In describing the moral condition of the heathen world, the author, instead of indulging in general declamation, or referring to extreme characters or acts, adopts the better plan of describing different departments of life in detail. Döllinger's *Gentile and Jew* gives fuller particulars than the present work, and supplies several points which Uhlhorn omits. But both Uhlhorn and Döllinger give details which we should hesitate to reproduce, while they pass by still worse matters in silence.

If the family is the basis of the nation, then national life was corrupted at its source. The old Roman simplicity and comparative purity had given place to universal profligacy. Which sex had sunk lowest or was most shameless it would be hard to say. It was Greece which had proved the corrupter of Rome. Greek notions and manners had always been marked by great laxity. It is enough to say that the social position of the courtesan was far more considerable than that of the wife. Marriage was regarded simply as an irksome duty to the State. Ordinary impurity was a matter of indifference. Even Socrates says, "Is there a human being with whom you talk less than with your wife?" The infection spread to Rome. Whereas according to some writers no divorce was known in Rome for several centuries after its rise, in the days of the Empire divorce became the rule. "There are women who count their years, not by the number of consuls, but by the number of their husbands," says Seneca. Tertullian says: "They marry only to be divorced." This is not mere rhetoric. Facts, if we could quote them, would amply

bear out the strongest statements. Marriage fell into such disrepute that laws had to be passed and rewards offered to encourage it—of course in vain.

If possible, a still more fruitful cause of degeneracy was the universal prevalence of slavery. Both in Greece and Rome, manual labour of every kind came to be looked on as disgraceful to free men, and as a consequence, free labour became extinct. The only hand-workers were slaves. The slave population formed a large portion of the community both in town and country, while those who should have been enriching themselves and the State by industry were maintained at the public expense in vicious idleness. There was probably never elsewhere a system of pauperism or of slavery so demoralising as that which obtained in Rome. No doubt the particular enormities might be rivalled elsewhere. The peculiar feature is that those enormities were part of a recognised system—were sanctioned by public law and the public conscience. In Cæsar's days the number receiving regular supplies of corn from the treasury in Rome was 320,000. "On an appointed day of the month each person enrolled on the lists received the *tessera frumentalis*, a check for five bushels of wheat. This amount was then measured out in the magazines to every one who brought and showed the *tessera*." Besides this, largesses of money were distributed. In the days of Augustus the people clamoured for wine. The Emperor told them to go to the aqueducts. Aurelian would have given wine. The Prætorian Prefect remonstrated, saying, "If we grant the people wine, we must also give them chickens and geese." The means for this extravagance were the spoils of a conquered world. From the temple of Jerusalem Crassus carried off two millions sterling. From Syria, Gabinius extracted three millions, and from Ptolemy Auletes two millions. The city of Tolosa was plundered to the extent of three millions. This went on over the whole extent of the world. Dr. Uhlhorn says truly enough (and the sentiment is not without its illustration in our days), "Wealth is not merely hazardous to the individual, it is also dangerous to a nation; doubly dangerous when it pours in suddenly, as in Rome, and has not gradually been acquired as the fruit of labour."

We cannot wonder that the condition of the bulk of the slaves was one of abject misery when we remember the light in which the slave was regarded. Aristotle divides

instruments into two kinds—inanimate and animate, slaves being included in the latter class. Varro also classifies instruments as dumb and articulate. The testimony of a slave was only received under torture, this being thought necessary to obtain the truth. The master's property in his slaves was absolute. In fact, a slave was just as much without separate rights, just as much outside all law, as cattle. The city slaves were worse off than those in the country, who at least enjoyed fresh air during the day, although at night they herded with the beasts. The city slaves, on the other hand, were shut up at night in the *ergastula*, dark, damp, partially subterranean slave prisons. The position even of the domestic slave was a very degraded one. He was at the mercy of every caprice. "A word, and he was sent to the field-slaves in the prisons on one of his master's estates, or scourged till blood came, or horribly killed, or thrown as food to the fishes. Caligula caused a slave who had made some trifling mistake at a public spectacle to be thrown into prison, tortured for several days in succession, and then executed when at last the putrefying brain of the poor wretch diffused too strong an odour for the cruel monster. A Roman magnate condemned a slave, who carelessly broke a valuable vase at a banquet in the presence of Augustus, to be thrown to the fishes, and not even the Emperor's intercession could save him. According to the old Roman law, when a master was killed in his house, the slaves who had passed the night under his roof were all executed if the murderer was not discovered. When, under Nero, the city prefect Pedanius Secundus was murdered, four hundred slaves of both sexes and all ages, down to the smallest children, were put to death." The matter was brought forward in the Senate, but grave senators advocated the execution of the law in the interests of public safety.

Side by side with abject misery went extravagance, the like of which the world has scarcely seen since. Lollia Paulina, spouse of Caligula, wore at a marriage festival a set of emeralds worth £400,000. Seneca says, "Women wear two or three estates in their ears." In the matter of houses, dress, feasts, gardens, the object seemed to be how to violate every law of economy, taste, and nature. The colonnades of Nero's Golden House were a mile long. In the vestibule a statue of the emperor rose to the height of 120 feet. Walls were literally covered with pearls. The

painted ceilings of the banqueting-rooms changed with the courses of the meal, and showered flowers and perfumes on the guests. Water from the sea and sulphurated water from the Tiber flowed through magnificent channels from gold and silver mouths into baths of many-coloured marbles. "Now I am lodged as a man should be," said Nero. Fortunes were spent on a single banquet. All earnestness had gone out of life.

In the theatrical exhibitions and public games grossness and cruelty contended for the mastery. The chief serious employment of the pauperised citizens was attendance at the games, which were very numerous and lasted many days at a time. The games to celebrate Trajan's Dacian triumph lasted 123 days. In Cæsar's time the circus had 150,000 seats; Titus added 100,000, and the number was increased to 385,000. Yet, with such provision, people came the night before to secure places. The city was stirred to its depths by the victories of the red or green, blue or violet, in the chariot races. "Whether a Nero governed the empire or a Marcus Aurelius," says Friedländer, "whether the empire was at peace or aflame with civil war, or the barbarians stormed at the frontiers, in Rome the question of chief moment for freemen and slaves, for senators, knights, and people, for men and women, was whether the blue or the green would win." Hippopotami from Egypt, wild boars from the Rhine, lions from Africa, elephants from India, fought for the delectation of the crowds. Six hundred bears and five hundred lions are mentioned at one festival. Still worse in their demoralising effects were the gladiatorial contests, when even women and children gloated over the wholesale shedding of human blood. Unwillingness to die on the part of a gladiator was resented, and rewarded with the death-sign. "In the pauses between the fighting, the soil of the arena, saturated with blood, was turned up with shovels, Moorish slaves threw on fresh sand, and smoothed again the place of combat. Then the shedding of blood began anew." There were other scenes still more sickening and hardening.

Of course there are some bright features to set over against these dark ones. A common epitaph on a wife was, "She never caused me a pang but by her death." But for the presence of better elements, society could not have held together. But the facts instanced above faithfully represent the general condition of Roman life in the first

centuries of the Christian era. The whole head was sick and the whole heart faint; from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot there was nothing but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores. There cannot be a better proof of the thorough and universal corruption than the fact that a succession of wise and good emperors like Vespasian, Hadrian, Trajan, and Aurelius were unable to arrest the progress of decay.

To heathenism Christianity presented an utter contrast, as superior in every moral characteristic as it was inferior in material strength and resources. The weapons which it brought to the conflict were all spiritual. It conquered by teaching and suffering. It taught the dignity of labour, the intrinsic worth of the soul, the blessedness of charity, the certain hope of immortality; and before these doctrines slavery, impurity, cruelty, and despair gradually vanished away. But at first and for a long time the result was doubtful, that is, doubtful to everything but divine faith. The story of Goliath and David found a grander illustration.

The usual practice has been to enumerate ten periods of persecution, linking with each one the name of a particular emperor. But this is a very mechanical method, reminding us of the old division of ecclesiastical history into centuries. In this way the distinctive characteristics of the different periods are to a great extent lost sight of, history being reduced to one dead level without so much as a hillock to give variety to the landscape. The period of persecution really divides itself into three clearly-marked stages, which no doubt roughly coincide with the three centuries covered by the history. First comes the period of irregular, spasmodic persecution; when the fate of the Christians depended altogether on the caprice of the authorities and the populace. Next follows the period of legal persecution, when all proceedings against Christians were regulated by fixed enactments. Last comes the period of aggressive persecution, when the Imperial Government became thoroughly alarmed and used all its resources to stop the progress of Christianity. This order corresponds with the natural course of things. At first, Christianity presented too contemptible an appearance to excite serious alarm or call for special legislation. It was looked on as a mere sect or superstition among abounding sects and superstitions. For a time also it was protected by its implication with Judaism. To a Roman the difference

between the two faiths was too insignificant for notice, just as Mohammedans nowadays affect to despise the quarrels of Christians, and the Romish Church affects to regard all Protestants as one. When Christianity separated itself altogether from Judaism, the State was compelled to define its relation to it. Then followed the edict of Trajan, which remained the law of the empire on this subject for more than a century. When the Church continued to grow in spite of legal pains and penalties, heathenism thoroughly took fright and began an active crusade. But it was then too late. The time for extirpating the Christian faith was past. We thus see that it was only the third period that was marked by systematic, deliberate persecution.

The chief event falling within the first period is the typical persecution of Nero, which was purely a work of arbitrary caprice. Much obscurity rests on the circumstances of this persecution. That an immense fire took place in Rome, that the blame was unjustly laid on Nero, that Nero made a scapegoat of the Christians, are established facts; but how Nero managed to connect Christians with the fire is not so clear. The cause of the absence of historical information is, no doubt, the contempt in which the Christians were held. A Tacitus or Suetonius looked on the sufferings of a "pestilential sect" as beneath investigation. The fire took place in the year 64. During six days and nights it raged without check, making a complete circle of the city, devastating ten out of fourteen districts, breaking out again and running its course for three days longer, and ceasing at last mainly from failure of material. Popular suspicion fastened on Nero, who had begun to show the hateful side of his character. The suspicion was, no doubt, unjust. Nero was absent from Rome at the time, and on returning did his best in seconding the efforts to extinguish the fire. But popular suspicion once raised is not easily laid. The most effectual method is to divert it to some other object; and this Nero did, accusing the Christians of the crime. The idea seems to have taken with the fickle populace. The Christians were far more accessible victims than the emperor, and they were held in ill repute. Common report attributed to them absurdly impossible enormities. Tacitus says, in effect, that although they did not set fire to Rome, they were capable of doing so. With or without reason, popular fury was let loose on them, and frightful scenes were

witnessed. Crucifixion was a merciful death in comparison with what many suffered. Some were dressed in the skins of wild beasts and worried to death by dogs. Others were brought upon the stage and made to represent in life the tragedies of antiquity. Thus, one Christian woman was bound to a wild bull, like Dirce, and dragged to death. Ingenuity devised new tortures and deaths. The Christians were covered with tow and pitch, bound to pine stakes, and made to illuminate Nero's gardens by night, emperor and people gloating with fiendish delight on the horrid spectacle. The Imperial example did not lack imitators in subordinate positions. During those years of scornful contempt many a name was added to the roll of martyrs, of which earth has no record. A similar outbreak of violence, on a smaller scale, marked Domitian's reign.

With Trajan, at the opening of the second century, a new stage began in the relations of the State to Christianity. Christianity was clearly distinguished from Judaism, and no longer enjoyed the immunities conceded to the latter as a *religio licita*. It became necessary, therefore, to decide how Christians were to be treated. The occasion was the letter of Pliny to Trajan, in which Pliny reported the difficulty in which he was placed by the great numbers of Christians under accusation, and asked for directions. The tenor of the emperor's reply is well known: the Christians were not to be sought out; but when accused, they were to be interrogated, and required to conform. If they persisted in refusing to sacrifice to the Imperial image, they were to be condemned. Tolerant such a decree cannot be called. The only advantage it secured was the repression of irregular caprice and cruelty, such as had been common before. Injustice was now done in due course of law. In the application of the law much was still left to the disposition of the rulers of the day. When a persecuting spirit was in the air, the law afforded ample scope for its gratification. When, on the other hand, a tolerant spirit was abroad, a magistrate often found means for declining to set the law in motion. The general position of things is thus pictured by Dr. Uhlhorn: "In spite of the leniency of the edict, the position of the Christians was still one of great difficulty. It is true that wholesale executions did not take place. The legends of such executions are legends, and transfer to this period

what really belonged to a later age. We have even reason to believe that the number who in those times died for their faith was comparatively small. But the sword hung, so to speak, every moment over their heads. They could not hide their faith without denying it. Every occasion called for a confession, and out of every confession an accusation might grow. Nothing more was needed to bring a Christian to trial, than that some one from religious zeal or private spite should inform against him. Instances are given which show that the conduct of the Christians towards the images of the gods, or at public festivals, gave occasion for accusation; that workmen informed against their fellows, and husbands against their wives. A heathen woman had been converted, and, as a Christian, renounced her former voluptuous life. After trying in vain to win her husband over to the faith, while he, on the other hand, used every means to draw her back to his godless life, her only course was to separate from him. Then her husband accused her of being a Christian. She confessed, and suffered for her faith. Well-disposed governors exercised extreme leniency, but with definite accusations they could do no otherwise than carry out the existing laws. And when the Christians had enjoyed tranquillity for a time, any day might bring a governor of a different disposition, who would act with the greatest severity. In some places the rage of the multitude was kindled against the Christians. At the festivals of their gods, and at the games, incited by the priests or wandering magicians, and intoxicated with sensual pleasure, the heathen would demand the death of the Christians. In great calamities the Christians were said to have aroused the anger of the gods. 'The Christians to the lions' was then the cry."

The permanent hurt done to Christianity by such means was not great. Persecution, if it is to be effectual, must be thorough. Carried on in a languid spirit, it stimulates rather than represses. This was the effect of the course followed during this second period. All the while Christianity was consolidating its position and riveting its hold on the people, and when the time of fiery trial came it was ready. This is the period of the great apologists, Justin, Minucius Felix, Melito, Athenagoras, whose works provoked replies from the Frontos and Celsuses of the day. The mere fact of Christianity giving a challenge to heathenism in the arena of literature, is no insignificant pheno-

menon. There are other even more interesting evidences of the way in which its influence was telling. "It was impossible that communities like the Christian Churches of that time, possessing such an energy of faith and love, should exist in the midst of the heathen world, without exercising an influence outside their own sphere, on the views and lives of those who continued heathen. There was, so to speak, a Christian atmosphere diffused around the Church, which penetrated even deeper into the atmosphere of heathenism, so that gradually even the air of Christianity began to be breathed." A series of phenomena now come to light, which, if they cannot be definitely traced to Christian influence, are in close affinity with the Christian spirit. Women and children, instead of being left absolutely in the power of husband and father, acquire rights of their own. The property of married women is protected. The wife is permitted to sue for a divorce as well as the husband. By a decree of Trajan, exposed children are free, instead of being brought up as slaves. Industrial institutions for boys and girls are established by the emperors, whose example in this respect is followed by private persons. "When Antoninus lost his wife Faustina, he thought that the best way to honour her memory was to found an institution for the support of poor girls (the *Puellæ Faustinianæ*); and Alexander Severus established a similar institution in honour of his mother, Mammaea (the *Pueri Mammariani*). The position and treatment of slaves underwent improvement." "Hadrian forbade the arbitrary killing of slaves; they were to be brought to trial, and condemned if guilty. He prohibited the sale of slaves, male or female, for disgraceful purposes. The *ergastula* were abolished, and the law which had destroyed so many persons, even as late as the time of Nero—namely, that when a master was murdered and the assassin was not discovered, all slaves under the same roof with the murdered man forfeited their lives—was so restricted that only those were to be put to death who were so near their master, that they might have been witnesses of the deed. Further, slaves could in certain case be admitted as witnesses; they could use their property to purchase their freedom, and public slaves were permitted to bequeath by will more than half of their possessions." Our author is not anxious to claim these changes for Christianity. He thinks that it is too early for Christian influence to have

begun to work so decisively, and is rather disposed to regard the whole movement as an independent one in the heathen world, which thus "took a step to meet Christianity." The phenomenon is an interesting one, however it is to be explained.

It has often been thought strange that one of the worst persecutions belonging to this second period, was due to Marcus Aurelius, perhaps the best-meaning emperor who ever sat on the throne. The explanation is to be found partly in the emperor's character, partly in the circumstances of his time. A Stoic, such as he was, could have no sympathy with Christian teaching. The Stoic and Christian ideals of life are diametrically opposed. The Christian Beatitudes are the antithesis of the *Meditations* of the philosophic emperor. The unexampled calamities which marked his reign, deepened the gloom of his natural temperament, and disposed him to listen to counsels of severity, such as Fronto, his adviser and a bigoted heathen, would be sure to give. The wars with the Parthians in the east and the barbarians in the west, were of the most desperate character, and these were followed by widespread famine and pestilence. Popular feeling again sought a scapegoat and found it in the Christians. Standing aloof from the national religion, they were treated as national enemies, and were supposed to have drawn down the anger of the gods. Under such influences a decree was issued which can only be described as infamous. Accusers of Christians were to be rewarded with the property of the condemned—the most powerful stimulus to persecution that could be applied. Here was a cheap and easy way to wealth, of which only too many were glad enough to avail themselves. Polycarp and Justin suffered under this reign. The letter of the Christians of Lyons and Vienne remains as a touching memorial of faith and patience in suffering.

Before the final crash came, heathenism was to pass through another still lower phase of development. The cold fit of scepticism was succeeded by a raging fever of superstition. There was an extraordinary revival of religious feeling, which expressed itself in the most abject excesses of superstition. Wisely directed, this revival might have given heathenism a longer lease of life; but under evil guidance it only accelerated the process of dissolution. While the reign of superstition was on one side a reaction from the negations of scepticism, on the other

hand it received an immense impetus from the calamities of the times. The men of those days witnessed the expiring throes of a vast empire. The convulsions were tremendous and extended through centuries. It is pitiful, even at this distance of time, to see the advancing decline of such greatness. The throne of Julius and Augustus was filled by wretches like Elagabalus and Caracalla, as low specimens of humanity as the world has ever seen. The emperors were the puppets of the army, who sold the purple by auction to the highest bidder. The spirit of freedom and art, of poetry and philosophy had evaporated. Admiration for mere size took the place of admiration for form. Gallienus projected a statue of himself 200 feet high, the spear in the hand of which was to contain a spiral staircase. "Men degenerated even physically; at least, one cannot help noticing that the portrait busts and statues of that period still extant, display an increasing ugliness. Their forms look unhealthy, either bloated or shrunken. In short, the world was growing old, and in old age became pious." The pity is, that the piety took such an abject form.

One of the popular deities was Pantheus, the very name symbolising the confusion that prevailed. Instead of the old homespun divinities, all Rome worshipped monstrosities from the East,—the Phrygian Atys, the Egyptian Anubis, Isis, and Serapis, the Persian Mithras, the Syrian Elagabalus. The faith in magic became universal. Fortune-tellers and magicians were the most powerful men in Rome. Faith in charms, incantations, amulets, is part of heathenism everywhere, but it now reached an incredible height. "Women and children were cut open alive in the presence of Diocletian's co-regent in order to inspect their entrails." Alexander of Abonoteichos, a common wizard and serpent-charmer, was consulted by Marcus Aurelius respecting the German war. Statues of him were commonly worshipped. The number of Mysteries—those of Isis, Kriobolium, Taurobolium—multiplied greatly. The Mysteries of Isis were among the most sensible and cleanly. "A long preparation preceded them, including abstinence from meat, baths, and sprinkling with water of consecration. The initiated and their friends brought votive offerings. On the consecration night, indicated by a dream, the novice watched in the temple, first in a harsh linen robe, then changing his robes twelve times, all of which had symbolic meanings, he went

through a number of scenes and visions which signified death and resurrection through the favour of Isis." "The mysteries of Mithras were more awe-inspiring, and they best show how much the heathen were willing to undergo in order to attain the expiation of their sins. There were different degrees of consecration—the *raven*, the *warrior*, the *lion*, and so on. Novices had to undergo many tests, called disciplines. There were eighty such disciplines:—fasting, standing and lying in ice and snow even for twenty days at a time, the rack, horrors, flagellations, &c. They were so severe that many lost their lives in them. Yet great numbers, including nobles and even emperors, pressed forward for the privilege of becoming warriors of Mithras." "The period presents a strange picture. One might feel inclined at the first glance to make it a subject of laughter and mockery, and yet it cannot be contemplated without sadness. Must the splendour of the ancient world end in such a witches' Sabbath? The world which has listened to a Socrates and a Plato, produced a Sophocles, and seen so much beauty which once shone with the glory of those works of art whose heroic proportions still inspire our youth—*this* world as it comes to an end prays to a thousand wondrous gods, dog-headed idols, and cone-shaped stones, creeps into the caves of Mithras, and seeks regeneration in the expiatory blood of the Taurobolium, trembles before ghosts and magic charms, and becomes the prey of every charlatan who palms off miracles upon it!" No wonder that such times gave birth to a Lucian—a heathen Voltaire—who turned everything—the soul, eternity, and God—into a jest. And yet such a scene furnishes matter for sadness rather than laughter.

One of the strangest phenomena of those strange days was the adoption of many Christian ideas and words by heathen teachers. The life of Apollonius of Tyana, by Philostratus, is a designed imitation of the life of Christ—the supernatural birth, miracles, ascension to heaven being all reproduced, of course with exaggerations and puerilities. "Standing on the steps of the temple at Ephesus, he was preaching, and, with vivid illustrations, was exhorting men to be helpful one to another. Near him were some sparrows quietly perched on a tree. There came another sparrow and uttered a cry, as if to communicate some tidings. Then they all flew away, and followed the messenger. Apollonius, seeing it, interrupted

his preaching, and said : ' A child was carrying some corn in a basket. She fell down, and then went on, after partially collecting the corn, but left some of it scattered in the street. The sparrow saw it and sought his fellows, that all might have a share in what he had found.' Some of those present immediately went, and found that it was indeed just as he had said. Then said Apollonius to the people : ' You see how much interest the sparrows manifest in each other's welfare ; and how willing they are to divide their possessions one with another ; but you, on the other hand, when you see that a man is sharing his property with another call him a spend-thrift.' " In his life of Appollonius, Philostratus sincerely attempted to set up a counterpart to the Gospel image of Christ, but the imitation was very poor, and if it had been better, would have been out of keeping with the rest of heathenism.

From the time of Aurelius to that of Decius, a period of seventy years, the Christians were treated with alternate mildness and severity. The worst persecution was that which took place in Alexandria and northern Africa. In Alexandria the father of Origen was among the sufferers, and Origen himself, then a mere child, narrowly escaped. In Carthage, two young women, Perpetua and Felicitas, were among the bravest sufferers. In the prison Perpetua had a vision which strengthened her—a vision of a golden ladder reaching to heaven, on either side swords, and spears, and knives, and at the foot a dragon. Mounting the ladder in Christ's name, she found at top a large garden and the Good Shepherd, who graciously received her. The judge besought her to recant in the name of her aged father, her aged father besought her in the name of her infant child. On refusing, she was condemned to the wild beasts with the rest. " Perpetua and Felicitas were enclosed in a net and exposed to a wild cow. When the hair and dress of Perpetua became disordered, she carefully rearranged them." When the young gladiator approached Perpetua to give the death-blow, his hand wavered. Thereupon Perpetua took his hand and guided it to her throat.

The third and final struggle began with Decius (A.D. 249—251) and ended with Diocletian. In the incessant frontier wars a race of martial emperors sprang up, who cherished the design of restoring the empire to its ancient glory. The mistake was in adopting heathenism as the basis. If Christianity had been accepted earlier there might have been hope

for the State, but heathenism was worn out. The motto of the Decian persecution was "Thorough," but it came too late. Christians were too numerous and too widely diffused to permit extirpation. If extirpation had been possible, it would only have left the empire helpless and bleeding at the mercy of the barbarians, who were storming the frontiers on every side. The severest measures were taken. All Christians were required by imperial decree to conform within a certain time. If any left the country their property was confiscated, and they were permanently banished. Those remaining were cited before a commission and required to recant. Failing to do this, they were thrown into prison and subjected to tortures which gradually increased in severity. Soon the storm of persecution was universal. Three Roman bishops—Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius—perished in succession. "In the catacombs may be seen to-day the simple gravestones of the martyr-bishops near together, each marked only with the name." "Besides these, the virgins Victoria, Anatolia, Agatha, and a great multitude of other martyrs, died under fearful tortures." In Alexandria the storm raged as fiercely as in Rome. "Even in the smaller towns and villages of Egypt many were numbered among the martyrs. In the Thebaid, the prefect had a Christian husband and wife crucified side by side. They lived for days upon the cross, and encouraged one another." Even children displayed a firmness under torture which astonished the persecutors. "In Toulouse, the bishop, Saturninus, was bound to a wild bull and dragged to death." The chief joy of the persecutors was in forcing the Christians to the shame of recantation. To this end all sorts of ingenious tortures were invented. The fingers were crushed, limbs dislocated, flesh torn off with nails and hooks. "The prisoners were exposed to the most intense heat and left to thirst for days; they were burned with fire, charcoal, and red-hot iron. Some were stripped, smeared all over with honey, and exposed to the stings of insects." "Those were the times in which the Christians, beset on every side, often betrayed and attacked in their assemblies, fled to the deserts and the woods, or descended to the dead in the catacombs. There in little companies they held their services, listened to the Word, and partook of the sacrament by the light of the terra-cotta lamps such as are often found there now. Those who gathered there did not know but that a fate might soon overtake them like that of those whose names were called over at the Lord's Supper as

confessors and martyrs, or whose unadorned graves with their simple inscriptions were all around them."

Valerian (253—260) tried new tactics—to banish the bishops and forbid gatherings for worship and prayers in cemeteries. These means were ineffectual. The bishops in exile maintained communications with their churches, besides carrying the Gospel into new regions. In 258 an edict was issued condemning bishops, presbyters, and deacons to death by the sword; senators and magistrates to lose their property, and, in case they still continued Christians, to death; women of rank to loss of property and exile; Christians at court to slavery on the imperial estates. Sixtus, bishop of Rome, was arrested while celebrating divine service in the catacombs, sentenced, taken back at once to the catacombs and beheaded. "Whither goest thou, father, without thy son? Whither goest thou, priest, without thy deacon?" cried Laurentius. "Cease weeping, thou wilt soon follow me," replied the bishop. Laurentius was roasted on an iron chair. One congregation of Christians was walled up to a living death. In Africa a number of Christians were burned in a lime-kiln.

Carthage had its full share of the honours of suffering and martyrdom. Cyprian, the bishop, heads the list. When brought before the proconsul, he was asked, "Thou art Thascius Cyprianus?" "I am." "Thou hast permitted thyself to be made an official in a sacrilegious sect?" "Yes." "The sacred emperors have commanded thee to sacrifice." "That I will not do." "Consider it well." "Do what is commanded thee: in a cause so just no reflection is necessary." The proconsul passed sentence. "Thascius Cyprianus shall be executed with the sword." "Thanks be to God," said the bishop, who unrobed, knelt down, prayed, and received the fatal blow.

After Valerian's capture by the Persians, the Church enjoyed comparative rest for forty years. That in such times of fiery trial many timid and half-minded Christians should apostatise was only natural. The chaff was thoroughly sifted from the wheat. The way in which such persons, when they desired to return to the Church, should be treated, was a vexed question in early days. On the whole, the Church pursued a middle course between undue severity and undue laxity. Another difficulty arose from the unbecoming conduct of some of the confessors, who thought that their suffering gave them merit and authority, and attempted to issue orders to the Church.

The last persecution of all under Diocletian was in some respects the fiercest. Diocletian was far from being a persecutor by temperament, and left to himself would never have become one. His instincts as a statesman alone would have preserved him from such a course. In this matter he was a tool in the hands of the heathen party at the court led by the Cæsar Galerius, a bigoted heathen. This party constantly insisted that the extirpation of Christianity was necessary to that restoration of Roman grandeur which was constantly floating before the minds of the emperors. For a long time Diocletian resisted the importunity, but at last yielded under an express stipulation that no blood should be shed. The stipulation was accepted, soon to be broken. The conspirators knew that the policy of violence, once begun, must be followed up. In the winter of 302 the signal was given. The scheme was to destroy the churches and all Christian books, the Scriptures included. The great church at Nicomedia, the imperial residence, was razed to the ground. An edict prohibited all assemblies for worship, and condemned Christian nobles to degradation, others to slavery. The Christians were accused of firing the imperial palace. The imperial household was collected and required to offer sacrifice. "The Christian officials refused. Then torture was used. Peter, an official of high rank, was beaten, his stripes rubbed with vinegar and salt, and then his limbs burned one after another. Nevertheless he joyfully confessed his faith. Finally, all who would not sacrifice were strangled." A second edict commanded that all the clergy should be imprisoned; a third, that the test of sacrifice should be applied to all the clergy; a fourth, that all Christians, without exception, should be put to the test.

By the abdication of Diocletian in 305, Galerius became supreme emperor. With the exception of Constantius in the west, who protected the Christians, his associates in the empire were like-minded. The work of blood was carried on in ruthless, wholesale fashion. The fierce savagery of the emperors communicated itself to their subordinates everywhere. The stories of ferocity seem incredible. Ten, twenty, even a hundred were slaughtered in a day. Sometimes a whole congregation was burnt with the building in which they were gathered for worship. In Phrygia a whole town was surrounded by soldiers and given up to fire and sword. "Galerius issued an edict ordering that the Christians should be put to death with slow fire. At first a little flame was placed

under the feet of the victim till the flesh, gradually calcining, fell from the bones, then the other parts of the body were burned one after another with torches. At intervals cold water was dashed into the faces of the tortured, in order that death might not come too soon." The people zealously seconded the Imperial efforts. "They hung up the Christians by the feet, and kindled fires beneath them, cut off their noses and ears, tore out their tongues, thrust out their eyes, and maimed their hands and feet by cutting the sinews. They poured melted lead over the Christians, and cut them in pieces. The corpses were not allowed to be buried, but left to dogs and vultures. This was also the time when Roman governors condemned Christian maidens, still wearing the fillet, the sign of their unsullied honour, to be flogged with rods, half-naked, up and down the streets—when it happened not infrequently that matrons and maidens of noble rank were sentenced to be taken to the brothel. More than once they preferred death to dishonour, and took their own lives to escape a worse fate. Their contemporaries counted such among the martyrs who died for their faith; but a later colder age cast doubt upon their claims to be considered martyrs." After six years of such outrage, there was a lull from sheer weariness. Again the storm broke out, and again there was a calm. A third time the work of death began on even a larger scale. But it was the last flicker of hate. From the bed on which in 311 Galerius lay dying a more shameful and miserable death than any he had inflicted, he issued an edict suspending the persecution, and the Church breathed again.

After Galerius came Constantine, and with Constantine Christianity finally triumphed. The chapter dealing with Constantine's character and work is not the least interesting in the book. Dr. Uhlhorn does not agree with the view that Constantine was influenced solely by political considerations, that he saw by an intuition of genius that the future belonged to Christianity and acted accordingly. Political considerations may have had their weight. Why not? But it seems probable that from the first genuinely Christian motives exerted some influence. Both Constantine and his father had always shown themselves favourable to Christianity, and there is no reason to doubt that Constantine really attributed to it his victory over his heathen rival. The victory over Maxentius, at the Milvian Bridge in 312, made him undisputed master of the west, and Licinius, also well disposed to Christianity, soon became supreme in the east. What-

ever view may be taken of the vision of the Cross, the old heathen symbols on the eagles, helmets, shields, coins were replaced by that of the cross. That Constantine was an exemplary Christian in all things, need not be maintained. We must remember his difficult circumstances and heathen surroundings. By the edict of Milan, 313 A.D., full toleration was accorded to Christianity, or rather to heathenism, for the two systems exchanged places, and Christianity became the religion of the State. Considering the state of things in the old world, it was inevitable that Constantine should perpetuate the national recognition of religion. The connection between religion and the State, whether for good or evil, is a legacy to us from the old heathen world which then passed away. By the defeat of Licinius, Constantine became master of the east, and thus over east and west the cross reigned. On the vision of the Cross our author remarks thus:—"I hold firmly that the exalted Saviour, as He promised, rules and guides His Church, and in this decisive moment He interposed. It pleased Him to condescend to Constantine, and to answer his questions, as God condescended to the wise men from the East, and by means of their astrological speculations led them to Bethlehem with a star. Constantine had hitherto revered the sun as the supreme God, and the cross placed upon the sun was to show him that the God who has revealed himself in the Crucified One is the supreme God; and when Constantine did not immediately understand, it was explained more particularly in a dream. Henceforth this was the banner under which he and his army fought, and the victories which he gained confirmed him in the belief that the God who gave him this sign was the supreme God."

Some speak as if the idea of the connection between Church and State originated with Constantine. On the contrary, as we have seen, the idea underlay the whole life of the ancient world. All that Constantine did was to put Christianity into the place occupied by heathenism. Our author says:—"Our own age is the first which has commenced to batter at Constantine's work, and many hold it necessary to demand the exact reversal of the step he took as the prerequisite of a step forward in the development of civilisation. Those who make this their endeavour would do well to consider that it was the State which, in its distress, sought the alliance with Christianity, because it needed a new bond with the conscience of the citizens, because it was in want of a new moral

salt to preserve the national life from complete corruption. If it should really come to pass that the bond which Constantine created between Christianity and national political life should be ruptured, it would soon become evident that the State cannot do without Christianity, and the national life would necessarily become hopelessly corrupt without the salt of the Christian religion. Retrograding beyond Constantine, the world would adopt Diocletian's policy : the attempt would have to be made once more to suppress Christianity by force, and then, either our national life and civilisation would go to ruin, as Diocletian's schemes and the whole antique civilisation went, or it would be necessary to decide upon doing Constantine's deed a second time, if that were still a possible thing." The author by no means commits himself to the approval of everything Constantine did. He discerns already the germs of the Byzantinism which was to work such evil within the Church, and to prepare the way for the triumph of the crescent. "State and Church were becoming an amalgamation fraught with peril. The State was becoming a kind of Church, and the Church a kind of State." For a long time Christianity and heathenism existed side by side, each reacting on the other. "In the new city on the Bosphorus, Constantine set up a colossal statue of himself. It was an ancient statue of Apollo. Its head was struck off, and a head of Constantine substituted. Inside the statue was placed a piece of what was supposed to be the holy cross discovered by the Empress Helena. This is a kind of mirror of the age. A heathen body with a Christian head, and Christian life at the heart ; for Christianity was in truth the dominant power within, though externally heathenism everywhere appeared, and would have to be gradually overcome from within. This unique character of the times is to be duly considered, if we are truly to estimate the actors on this stage. Only then can we judge Constantine fairly even in his faults ; only then can we comprehend how Julian could form the purpose of restoring heathenism, and also why his scheme would necessarily be wrecked." On the subject of Julian's career, of which our author gives a brief and interesting sketch, we need not enter. His attempt was the last flash of life in a system that had lived so long and seen such a history. With it the faith that had made Greece and Rome what they were, and by which generations upon generations of men and women had lived and died, passed away for ever.

We have quoted enough to show that Dr. Uhlhorn's book

gives a vivid picture of a world long since dead and buried. It is full of new material, animated, always thoughtful, often eloquent. We wish the translation were equal to the goodness of the matter. The second part, by Mr. Ropes, is well done. Not so the first. "Christians made earnest with the word of our Lord" (p. 197) is good German, but no English. The same may be said of "help swell" (p. 108), instead of "help to swell." Divisions of words like "prog-ress," "bish-op," have not a graceful look. In an American translation less can be said against such spellings as "labor," "honor," "favor," and the reckoning of money in dollars. But these defects only concern the English dress. The book is full of instruction as to the past, and suggestion as to the present. Not a few lessons bearing on present circumstances may be gathered from such studies of a past time.

ART. VII.—*A New Testament Commentary for English Readers.* By Various Writers. Edited by CHARLES JAMES ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vol. III. Cassell, Petter and Galpin.

No apology is needed for delay in noticing this work. It is not one that could be summarily despatched; indeed, after examining it with much care, and pondering some parts of it very earnestly, we feel that we are hardly yet equal to the task of a general review. Nor need we explain why we take this volume in particular as the basis of our remarks. It is the last volume, and deals with books of peculiar importance; but we must confess that our real reason is the special interest which this Journal has in one of the writers, the commentator on the Hebrews.

Our general estimate of the great work which is coming out under the auspices of Bishop Ellicott has been already incidentally given. We may briefly recapitulate some of the points that distinguish it. First, it is for English readers, and so composed that the student who knows only English shall be able to extract from it almost its richest treasures; we know some plain men of business who prefer it to any other commentary, because, as they say, it never carries them far beyond their depth. And with this may be connected a certain vigour, not to say liveliness of style, which is quite remarkable, though this does not apply to all the writers. Secondly, while this work is steadfastly and of set purpose adapted to the comparatively unlearned reader, it presents all the fruits of the highest culture and of the soundest Biblical learning. We may feel sure that the commentary is an explanation of the true text of the New Testament, a point of the deepest importance. We may be equally sure that the exposition, while seeming to unfold the English translation, is really expounding the Greek; and, moreover, that grammatical exegesis is represented in its highest type: the writers' own names are guarantees of this, even apart from the supreme guarantee of the Editor. Once more, this exposition is not simply a hard interpretation of the bare letter. It keeps dogmatic interests in view, and its doc-

trinal standard cannot be far wrong when Bishop Ellicott is the guardian of its application. It might perhaps be possible to show that once or twice the standard is not so rigorously applied here as it is applied in the Bishop's own commentaries; but this has reference rather to the way of stating the truth than to the truth itself. Again, there is a most refreshing freedom, and honesty, and breadth in these expositors; they dare to give the plain results of unforced interpretation, without fear of human censure, being confident in the self-evidencing and self-protecting power of the Word of God which they expound. And the reverence that distinguishes the whole is as remarkable as the learning and thoroughness. It is not merely that there is a tone of devoutness running through all; there is also—what is of less importance, but important still—the perpetual exhibition of all those minor tokens and symbols of reverence which in our estimation are of great price. Finally, the Introductions to the several Epistles are most valuable, though not all of equal value. Generally speaking, they mark a decided advance in this part of Biblical literature. They are most pleasant reading; and, in the case of St. Peter's First Epistle, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, wonderfully prepare for what follows. The Introduction to St. John's Epistle is notably valuable, as containing good disquisitions on the characteristics of the Epistles on Biblical theology; indeed, in this case, the introduction is, in our humble judgment, even better than the commentary, a remark which may be applied, though with more hesitation, to the Introduction of the Second Epistle of Peter.

After what has been said, it will appear obvious that these volumes ought to be on the shelves of all our theological students and candidates for the ministry. Supposing the Old Testament to be dealt with in the same style, there will be no work of the kind, on the whole, to be compared with it. While writing this, we remember the fact that the *Speaker's Commentary* is drawing towards its close; and that the *Popular Commentary*, edited by Dr. Schaff, which is really an Anglo-American candidate for favour, is ready to present its second volume. The former of these has been subjected to much harsh criticism, but it will long continue to command the respect of scholars as well as the English public at large. In fact, the exposition of St. John, in the volume just issued, would make the fortune of any such work, and even retrieve its character if it had been in any respect

impaired. But that work is very costly, and will never be the familiar companion of our students and candidates for the ministry. The voluminous Bible-work of Lange is also out of the question for the same reason. Some of its volumes are exceedingly valuable, but they labour under the serious disadvantage of excessive prolixity and superfluity of material. The commentaries issued by Messrs. Clark in the Theological Library are among the best that can be got—some few of them are the very best—but they do not cover the whole of Scripture. What we want is a commentary on the entire Bible, written on one principle and one scale, to be referred to with confidence by the student, as it respects both its true exegesis and its doctrinal soundness. And we are bound to say that, on the whole, we have seen none which comes nearer to the standard than this one which Bishop Ellicott is editing.

One point referred to in the preceding paragraph may be further dwelt on. These expositions are very remarkable for the extent to which they really expound the Greek text, without introducing a word of Greek. There can be no doubt that our best commentaries are monographs on the original, and it happens that we have in the English language some of the finest examples of this kind of commentary on precisely the books which occupy the present volume. We have only to refer to the Editor's own most valuable works, the suspension of which is a public loss. Bishop Lightfoot's admirable series embraces several of them. These expositions of the original, with their supplementary dissertations and *obiter* discussions, are simply unrivalled; alas, that these also are too likely to be interrupted, though this possible calamity we need not too confidently forecast. But the treatises in the present volume are as nearly expositions of the original as the absence of the original will allow. Much skill as well as much learning has gone to the production of this result. We have read the volume with care, and have been struck to find with what felicity the writers have introduced subtleties of exposition which we have been accustomed to think unattainable without the actual appearance of the original words in the court. Now and then, of course, there will necessarily be a halt; as, for instance, where the expositor of the Hebrews refers to a "peculiarity in the Greek construction which we cannot here discuss;" though even in that case, unless we are mistaken, the very peculiarity in question contributes its part in the interpretation. The importance of what we here refer to cannot be exaggerated. In it lies one of the most

marked elements of the superiority of our best modern exegesis. The close student of the original may read these notes with his Greek text before him, and find that he is really reading a comment on it. The comparatively unlearned reader may be confident—or as nearly confident as the necessary limitations of the case will allow—that he has before him an exact grammatical interpretation of the exact text; that, moreover, being expounded by men faithful to the truth as there is truth in Jesus.

It was our purpose to attempt a characterisation of each of the several contributions to the volume; but, having begun with Dr. Moulton's, we have been carried by the interest of his work to such a degree of enlargement as rendered a change in that plan necessary. The result is that we shall almost entirely limit ourselves to that one which is, if not the most difficult, certainly one of the most difficult of the tasks included in this volume. Of Dr. Moulton's qualifications for the work it seems superfluous to speak; but we cannot refrain from referring to them. Our own interest in him and justice to his merit here unite, as they unite in no other case. Years of faithful diligence have made him master—we were going to write a perfect master—of the characteristics of Greek-Testament diction; the various history of past translations and the demands of the translation that is to be are as familiar to him as perhaps to any living scholar; his dogmatic and historical theology keep pace with his other credentials; and, as we believe, his many acquirements are valued by himself, even as we value them, mainly as they are accepted in the service of the common Master. It is a foregone conclusion that his commentary in this volume will be a valuable addition to our evangelical literature. It is, indeed, exceedingly valuable. We have read it—and the We includes a great many—with deep profit; and with no qualification of our joy save that which results from its compression, and an occasional sigh that stern limits would not allow the author to expatiate where expatiation would be useful, and to defend the truth he so carefully lays down where defence seems to be demanded. Though we have no manifesto of his theory of exposition, it is evident on every page that Dr. Moulton's theory is a very strict one. It is his business to expound faithfully the true text of his document; pouring on it all the light of other Scripture, but introducing very sparingly the sidelights of historical and polemical theology. We know no commentary that concentrates at-

tention so sacredly and so searchingly on the thread of the text itself. Hence, it might be expected that the scope of the Epistle would be carefully tracked. That will be found to be the case. We have just finished reading the analyses themselves, as given in the introduction and at the several points in the Epistle; and think we understand the whole Epistle better than we did before. Probably the reader will find the same result from the same experiment.

The introduction to a commentary on the Hebrews can hardly fail to be elaborate. We commend Dr. Moulton's to careful study as a model of its kind. At first we were disposed to think that one section of it should have been devoted to its characteristics in relation to Pauline theology; but we presently found that this object was sufficiently attained, though indirectly, in the discussion of the Pauline authorship. Thoroughly to discuss the question of authorship requires very great skill; and the reader will admire the conduct of the argument, even apart from its conclusion. In the following sentence Dr. Moulton speaks, as he is able to speak, with some authority: we quote it partly, however, to show what sort of elements enter into the discussion of the question. After observing—and it is a significant fact—that in the ancient testimonies here adduced, “we find more or less clearly stated almost all the possible solutions of the problem;” and after dismissing as absolutely untenable the hypothesis that the Greek document is a translation, Dr. Moulton explains clearly and candidly the merits of the case.

“In its general arrangement and plan the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot but remind us of St. Paul. It is true there is no opening salutation, or direct address, such as is found in all St. Paul's Epistles. These Epistles, however, differ greatly amongst themselves in this respect. Thus, in writing to the Galatians, the Apostle is impatient of anything that may detain him from the great topics on which he is to speak; and it is possible to imagine reasons which might lead him to avoid all mention of the Church addressed, and even to keep back his own name. But waiving this, we recognise at once the familiar plan: first the discussion of dogmatic truth; then the earnest exhortation based on the doctrine thus presented; and, lastly, the salutations, interwoven with personal notices, with doxology and prayer. The main outlines of theological teaching are in close accord with St. Paul's Epistles: chaps. ii. and v., for example, as strikingly recall Phil. ii. as does chap. xiii. the closing chapter in the Epistle to the Romans.

Other points of special resemblance will easily suggest themselves, such as the relation of the writer to those whom he addresses (chap. xiii. 18, 19, &c.), the mode in which he refers to Timothy (verse 23), his Pauline illustrations (see Notes on chaps. v. 12, 13, xii. 1—4), his choice of Old-Testament passages. Under the last head may be specially mentioned the quotation of Ps. viii. (1 Cor. xv. 25—28) and Deut. xxxiii. 30 (Rom. xii. 19); see the Notes on chaps. ii. 6, x. 90. It is not necessary to go into further detail in proof of a position allowed by all, that (as has been already said) the Epistle, whether by St. Paul or not, is Paul-like in the general character of its teaching, and in many of its special features."

The term "Paul-like" is a very good addition to the customary phraseology of writers on this question. Certainly, there are parts of the Epistle which almost irresistibly suggest the presence of the Apostle's hand as well as the general presence of his spirit and mind. As it approaches its close it almost seems as if he had taken up the pen and written in large letters, in evidence of his acceptance and ratification of the whole. One cannot help feeling that the prayer in the last chapter is his; and the Benediction of Grace at the end, his "token in every Epistle," produces the same effect. But it is impossible to resist the conclusion which the writer of this Introduction so ably sets before us, that it is impossible or all but impossible to suppose that the entire Epistle came as it is from his hands. But, if we proceed further to study the matter under his guidance, we shall commit ourselves to the investigation of a question which is literally unlimited. The truth will probably never be known. There are secrets in the construction of all Scripture, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, which are hid from us as they were hid from our fathers, much nearer than we are to the original sources of knowledge. Why they are hidden it is useless to ask. It can never be proved that the virtue and value of any book is dependent on the name of its author. A high and tranquil faith in the Saviour's promise that His Church should be guided into all the truth will not too curiously inquire into what we are forbidden to know. Of course, it would be a deep satisfaction to be assured that our Epistle came directly from Apostolic hands; and we do not wonder at the enthusiasm felt by the Bishop of Lincoln in defence of the Pauline authorship. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the addition of the Epistle to the Hebrews to his other works impresses a symmetry and a certain seal of perfection in St.

Paul's literary contribution to the construction of the Christian system of faith. But all is really gained if we can assure ourselves that St. Paul is the master in the school which produced the Epistle. Whether his influence is in it through the medium of St. Peter or of Apollos is comparatively a lesser point.

Dr. Moulton carefully considers the subordinate defences of the Pauline authorship. We have space only for one valuable sentence.

"The alleged differences of doctrinal statement are of three kinds. Of St. Paul's favourite topics some are absent from this Epistle, some are treated in a different manner; and, again, certain themes here brought into prominence are not noticed in the Epistles of St. Paul. Thus we find only one passage in this Epistle in which the resurrection of our Lord, ever a prominent topic with St. Paul, is mentioned (see chap. xiii. 20); the law, faith, righteousness, are looked at from a different point of view; the prominence here given to the High-priesthood of Jesus is foreign to St. Paul's Epistles. It would require a volume duly to examine the various particulars adduced under this head; for the real question is not whether the teaching is *opposed* to St. Paul's, but whether the various themes are treated in the manner characteristic of the Apostle. We do not believe that the most careful examination will detect any real discord between the dogmatic teaching of this Epistle and that of St. Paul; but the peculiarities in selection of topics and in mode of treatment are sufficient (even when all allowance has been made for the special position and aim of the Epistle) to suggest that, if St. Paul 'laid the foundation,' it is another who 'buildeth thereon,' 'according to the grace of God which is given unto' him (1 Cor. iii. 10). The resemblances in teaching may show the presence of the Apostle, but the new colouring and arrangement prove that he is present only in the person of a disciple on whom his Master's mantle has fallen, and who is taught by the same Spirit."

The reader must diligently read for himself the whole section; the middle passage of the quotation just given will perhaps lead him to the conclusion that the writer of the Epistle was very far from being a mere amanuensis of the Apostle. The method of quoting the Old Testament, as it will be found very fully stated here, leads to the same issue. Reviewing the whole case, Dr. Moulton points out that there is only one conclusion that appears possible: that the Epistle was written by one who had stood in a close relation to St. Paul, but not by St. Paul himself. Three names are

mentioned by early writers: those of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and St. Luke. As to St. Luke, "we can hardly doubt that we have before us here the work of a Jew; but St. Paul's words in Col. iv. 11, 14, imply that St. Luke was of Gentile birth." More weighty as against St. Luke is the remark: "The difference between a letter such as this and historical or biographical memoirs must indeed be taken into account; but, even when allowance has been made for this, it is difficult to receive the writer of the Acts as the author of our Epistle." This is the difficulty we ourselves feel. It seems equally distasteful to accept an hypothesis which Luther was the first to mention; namely, that Apollos was the author. But let us hear the modest conclusion of our present authority. "If it be not unbecoming to go beyond the words of Origen on such a subject as this, and to favour an hypothesis for which no express evidence can be adduced from ancient times, we can have no hesitation in joining those who hold that it is the Jew of Alexandria, 'mighty in the Scriptures,' 'fervent in spirit,' the honoured associate of St. Paul, who here carries on the work which he began in Achaia, where 'he mightily convinced the Jews, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ.'" The words of Origen referred to are those, as already quoted in the Introduction: "But if I were to give my own opinion, I should say that the thoughts belong to the Apostle, but the diction and the composition to some one who wrote from memory the Apostle's teaching, and who, as it were, commented on that which had been said by his teacher. If then any church holds this Epistle to be Paul's, let it be approved even for this. For not without reason have the men of olden time handed it down as Paul's. But as to the question who wrote the Epistle, the truth is known by God (only); but the account which has reached us is a statement by some that Clement, who became Bishop of Rome, was the writer, by others that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts."

We think there are few who do not at once feel the full force of the argument in favour of Apollos. When that name is once suggested, it seems to plead its claims almost irresistibly. The style of the whole Epistle is in harmony with what we know of his genius; and several individual passages, such as that on "the doctrine of baptisms," receive a peculiar illustration from the suggestion. But still the wonder remains that "the men of olden time" did not men-

tion him; that Origen himself, and the Alexandrian Fathers generally, never set up a claim in behalf of their earliest and most distinguished light. Luther's *ut ego arbitror* seems to have been the first note of this opinion.

But leaving this question, about which, if we mistake not, the controversy will soon be raised again, let us take up a few points of the exposition itself. We have only limited space, and shall not attempt to examine the treatment of all the difficult passages of the Epistle. Our readers must do that for themselves. We shall make our beginning with the very first note, simply as a specimen of the style and manner of the whole. It is a typical note, as showing the result of great skill in bringing all the salient points of the original into a few elegant and luminous sentences. Having quoted this in full, we must afterwards use our leisure to detach and remark upon a few sentences here and there :

"*God, who at sundry times. . .* The fine arrangement of the words in the Authorised Version fails, it must be confessed, to convey the emphasis which is designed in the original. The writer's object is to place the former revelation over against that which has now been given; and the remarkable words with which the chapter opens (and which might not inaptly serve as the motto of the whole Epistle) strike the first note of contrast. If we may imitate the artistic arrangement of the Greek, the verse will run thus, 'In many portions and in many ways God having of old spoken unto the fathers in the prophets.' To the fathers of the Jewish people (comp. Rom. ix. 5) God's Word was given, part by part, and in divers manners. It came in the revelations of the patriarchal age, in the successive portions of Holy Writ: various truths were successively unveiled through the varying ministry of law, and of prophecy, and of promise, ever growing clearer through the teaching of experience and history. At one time the word came in direct precept, at another in typical ordinance or act, at another in parable or psalm. The word thus dealt out in fragments, and variously imparted, was God's Word, for the revealing Spirit of God was 'in the prophets' (2 Cor. xiii. 3). We must not unduly limit the application of 'prophet;' besides those to whom the name is directly given, there were many who were representatives of God to His people, and interpreters of His will. (Comp. Num. xi. 26, 29; Ps. cv. 15.)

"*Hath in these last days. . .* Better, at the end of these days spake unto us in a Son. The thought common to the two verses is 'God hath spoken to man;' in all other respects the past and the present stand contrasted. The manifold successive partial disclosures of God's will have given place to one revelation, complete and

final; for He who spake in the prophets hath now spoken 'in a Son.' The whole stress lies on these last words. The rendering 'a Son' may at first cause surprise, but it is absolutely needed; not, 'Who is the Revealer?' but, 'What is He?' is the question answered in these words. The writer does not speak of a *Son* in the sense of one out of many; the very contrast with the prophets (who in the lower sense were amongst God's sons) would be sufficient to prove this, but the words which follow, and the whole contents of this chapter, are designed to show the supreme dignity of Him who is God's latest Representative on earth. The prophet's commission extended no farther than the special message of his words and life; 'a Son' spoke with His Father's authority, with complete knowledge of His will and purpose. It is impossible to read these first lines (in which the whole argument of the Epistle is enfolded) without recalling the prologue of the fourth Gospel. The name 'Word' is not mentioned here, and the highest level of St. John's teaching is not reached; but the idea which 'the Word' expresses, and the thought of the Only Begotten as declaring and interpreting the Father (John i. 18; also John xiv. 10), in the words, 'at the end of these days.' St. Peter speaks of the manifestation of Christ 'at the end of the times' (1 Peter i. 20); and both in the Old Testament and in the New we not unfrequently read 'at the end (or, *in the last*) of the days.' (See 2 Peter iii. 3; Jude, verse 18; Num. xxiv. 14; Dan. x. 14, &c.) The peculiarity of the expression here lies in '*these days*.' The ages preceding and following the appearance of Messiah are in Jewish writers known as 'this world' (or, *age*), and the 'coming world' (or, *age*); the 'days of Messiah' seem to have been classed sometimes with the former, sometimes with the latter period; but 'the end of these days' would be understood by every Jewish reader to denote the time of His appearing."

Again and again the student will observe with what care clauses of interpretation are framed for the protection of doctrine. We sometimes think they ought to be expanded, and their extreme importance shown. But the expositor is governed by his own canons of art, and we must be thankful for the result without complaining. For instance, when the holy writer says, "Whom He appointed Heir of all things," we are reminded that this does not refer to the Son's essential Lordship; He "having become so much greater than the angels as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Then follows the note: "Not that this name first belonged to Him as *exalted Mediator*; but the glory which 'became' His (verses 3, 4) is proportionate to and consonant with the name which is His by essential

right (ver. 2)." Reading the following verses in the light of this suggestive sentence, we feel its importance in the interpretation of "this day have I begotten Thee." Our expositor says: "The declarations of verses six and seven are typical of the enthronement of the Messiah. St. Paul (Acts xiii. 33) refers the words here quoted to the period of the resurrection. With this the language used above (ver. 4) perfectly agrees. As, however, in that verse the exaltation of the Christ is declared to correspond to that *essential* dignity which lay in the name Son—a name which in this very context bears its highest sense (ver. 1—3)—we are constrained to regard the 'day' of the resurrection as itself typical, and to believe that 'this day' also pointed to the 'eternal now;' to what Origen (on John i. 1) speaks of as 'the day which is co-extensive with the unbegotten and everlasting life of God.'" Of course all depends here on the meaning of "pointed to." We hesitate to think that "this day" should be pressed into the service of Origen's thought, sublime as that is. The begetting of the Son in our nature, and with His full Messianic dignity, was perfected in the resurrection; and the "day" of the incarnation had then its full significance, being rounded by the worship of the angels, who worshipped the Son both at His birth in time and His perfected birth from the sepulchre. But the expositor's canon seems to us satisfied if the begetting into Mediatorial authority is "consonant with" His original dignity, without giving eternity the designation of "to-day." But it is Origen's exposition, and not Dr. Moulton's.

"And when He again shall have led the Firstborn into the world He saith." Thus translated, the words do not seem to allow that the incarnation is meant here, any more than it is meant in "this day have I begotten Thee." Nor do they seem to us absolutely to require an allusion to the future restoration of the Firstborn into "the world of men" at the judgment. The Son, begotten in human nature and the world of men in His finished exaltation, or His resurrection, receives the homage of angels, who worship Him now as the supreme authority on human affairs. But we must hesitate in the face of such a sentence as this: "When the Messiah, reigning as the Firstborn of God (see ver. 5), shall appear for judgment—that is, when God sendeth a second time His Firstborn into 'the world of men' (see chap. ii. 5), that He may receive full possession of His inheritance—He saith, And let all angels of God worship Him." But it seems to

us that the present humble ministration of angels is co-ordinate with the present supreme authority of the Son, already led into His inheritance. Nor does the "shall have led" or the "again" seem peremptorily to refuse this interpretation.

For the notes on ch. iv. 15 and v. 8 we are very grateful; still with the reservation hinted at, that we should have been thankful if the cautions so admirably suggested had been illustrated by application to errors, showing their necessity. Any one who reads the elaborate and exhaustive, and withal wearisome expositions of Delitzsch on these passages, will feel how exceedingly difficult it is to reach an unexceptionable interpretation, and will appreciate the triumph of our expositor in being able to reduce to a few clear and perfect sentences the whole truth. For instance, on ch. iv. 15, which is introduced by a striking note of the order in the thought: "We cannot but note again how the power of the exhortation (especially to those immediately addressed) lay in the combination of the two thoughts: the greatness and the tender compassion of the High Priest of our confession. The two are united in the words of verse 16, '*the throne of grace*' (comp. ch. viii. 1). The beautiful rendering '*touched with the feeling of our infirmities,*' is due to the Genevan Testament of 1557." Before proceeding to our note we may observe two things: first, the value of many of these brief expositions to the preacher; and, secondly, the deeply interesting hints occasionally given of the genesis and growth of our present translation. As to the former point, the present exposition is exceedingly valuable for its apt suggestion of those striking felicities of allusion and antithesis which are so important in the making of a sermon; and which in these pages are often brought out by a happy revision of the rendering. We have noted more than a dozen of them; but must leave their discovery to reward the reader's own diligence. The note runs:

"*But was in all points . . . Better, but One that hath in all points been tempted in like manner, apart from sin.* Those words show the nature and the limits of this sympathy of Christ. He suffers with His people, not merely showing compassion to those who are suffering and tempted, but taking to Himself a joint feeling of their weaknesses. He can do this because He has passed through trial, has Himself been tempted. In speaking of '*weaknesses*' the writer uses a word applicable both to the people and to their

Lord, who was 'crucified through weakness' (2 Cor. xiii. 4). Its meaning must be limited to the region of pain and bodily suffering: whatever belongs to the necessary limitations of that human nature which He assumed is included. As He learned His obedience from sufferings (chap. v. 8), He gained His knowledge of the help we need in that 'Himself took our weaknesses' (Matt. viii. 17), and was Himself tempted in like manner, save that in Him sin had no place (chap. vii. 26). These last words supply the limit to the thought of weakness and temptation as applied to our High Priest. Not only was the temptation fruitless in *leading to sin* (this is implied here, but only as a part or a result of another truth), but in the widest sense He could say, 'The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me' (John xiv. 30). 'Was tempted in all points in like manner,' are words which must not be over-pressed; but the essential principles of temptation may be traced in those with which Jesus was assailed. (Comp. John xxi. 25)."

We are bound to include the second clause of the final sentence in our quotation; and equally bound to believe that it contains the truth. The words are suggestive, and imply—of course we are giving our own interpretation of them—that we have not a full record of all the methods by which our Lord was assailed; and that in Him and His conflicts were exemplified the essential principles of temptation. Every word used in this commentary is well weighed; but we must throw around this term "essential" the protection of the clear sentences that precede it. We are very sure that Dr. Moulton will allow us to remind his readers that the strength of the paragraph just quoted is in the clause: "Those last words supply the limit to the thought of weakness and temptation as applied to our High Priest." That noble parenthesis ("this is implied here, but only as a part or a result of another truth") has wrapped up in it all we would say. But we cannot help feeling that many of the readers of this note will need a much more explicit statement of the truth that at all points our Lord was not tempted as we are. They need to have the subtle misconception of their own minds as it were revealed to them; and to be shown that their notion of the Redeemer's sympathy and example really involves the ascribing to Him some share, however infinitesimally small, in our original sin. Everything pertaining to the Person of our Lord has in some sense its peculiarity; however like unto us, there is an unlikeness behind or beneath every resemblance, without which He could be no Redeemer.

One of the essentials of our temptation is that it is a solicitation of lust that conceives sin and brings it forth: in our Heavenly Representative there was no mother-lust. The temptations or trials of the Messiah were not like any other trials; there were never sorrows like those of the Redeemer. This is the meaning of the cautionary note. But many want to have it made plain to them that the reality of our Lord's human nature and union with man does not require that He should overcome the evil that we have to overcome. We have no right to expect the expositor to enter into the subtilities and unfathomable difficulties involved in the attempt to explain his own important words, "the limits of His temptation." We know what the confusion is in which such writers as Richm and others have entangled themselves. We think that perhaps Dr. Moulton might have succeeded better than they. But we are thankful for what he has said in the way of wise and necessary caution.

The student will remember that these words are preceded by that wonderful passage concerning the "Word of God:" we say Word with the capital, not as prejudging the question whether the Second Person of the Trinity be meant. Of course, our strong predilection would be for interpreting this of the Divine High Priest with whom we have to do; but predilection has no place in such a discussion. The noble commentary of Dean Jackson had long ago convinced us that this interpretation is the sound one; and we suspect that Dr. Moulton has an ally and pleader for it in his own heart. But we cannot imagine him doing violence to what he deems exegetical necessity: so that interpretation goes. "Outside the writings of St. John there is no passage in the New Testament in which the word of God is so clearly invested with personal attributes as here." "But though these, and the many other resemblances that are adduced, may prove the writer's familiarity with the Alexandrian philosophy, they are wholly insufficient to show an adoption of Philo's doctrinal system (if system it could be called) in regard to the Divine Word, or to rule the interpretation of the single passage in this Epistle in which an allusion to that system could be traced. Nor is the first-mentioned argument conclusive. There certainly is personification here, and in part the language used would, if it stood alone, even suggest the presence of a Divine Person; but it is not easy to believe that in the New Testament the words 'sharper than a two-edged sword' would be directly applied to the Son of God." It is

hard to evade the force of this last sentence ; unless, indeed, we suppose that the writer glides from the Word Himself to His utterance without marking the distinction, and then returns to the Person "with whom we have to do." This is indeed not very far from the meaning of the good solution here given : "that characteristic of the Epistle to which reference has been already made—the habitual thought of Scripture as a *direct* Divine utterance." We must try to hold fast the Divine Eternal Word, with our expositor's half permission : thanking him for reminding us that the sword divides soul and spirit (not soul *from* spirit), but not thanking him for leaving us to our own lights on the remarkable close, "with whom" (or, and with Him) "we have our word or account."

Now let us pass to the second note, which is obviously the issue of much pondering, and condenses as much solution of difficulty as any paragraph in the commentary. It is on ch. v. 7, 8, and our admiration of it constrains us to give it exactly as it stands :

"*Who in the days of His flesh. . .* It will be observed that, of the essential conditions mentioned in verse 2 and verse 4, the latter is first taken up in its application to Christ (verses 5, 6). This verse and the next correspond to the general thought of verses 1, 2, so far as it is applicable to 'Him who knew no sin.'

"The following rendering will, it is believed, best show the meaning of these two important verses, and the connection of the several parts : *Who, in the days of His flesh, having with a strong cry and tears offered up prayers and supplications unto Him that was able to save Him out of death, and having been heard for His reverent fear, though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered.* The most noticeable change of rendering occurs at the close of the seventh verse ; here the interpretation given by all the Greek Fathers, following in most of our English versions (and in the margin of the Authorised itself), certainly deserves the preference over that which, through the influence of Calvin and Beza, found its way into the Genevan Testament, and hence into the Bishop's Bible, and the translation of 1611. The word rendered 'reverent fear' occurs in but one other place in the New Testament (chap. xii. 28) ; but the kindred verb and adjective are found in chap. xi. 7 ; Luke ii. 25 ; Acts ii. 5, viii. 2. It properly denotes, not terror, but a cautious foreseeing fear, opposed alike to rashness and to cowardice : the adjective, which is 'always rendered devout,' is fully explained in the Notes on Acts ii. 5. No word could be more suitable where the relation of the Son of Man to His 'God and Father' is expressed ; and it would be very difficult to find

any other word which should be suitable to this relation, and yet contain no implication of sin to be acknowledged with humility and shame. The object of the 'prayers and supplications' thus heard and answered is implied in the words 'unto Him that was able to save Him *out of death*.' Not 'from death:' the Greek words may have that meaning, but it is not their most natural sense, as a comparison of other passages would show. The prayer, we are persuaded, was not that death might be averted, but that there might be granted deliverance out of death. This prayer was answered: His death was the beginning of His glory (chap. ii. 9). It may, indeed, be asked, Could such a prayer be offered by One who knew 'the glory that should follow' His sufferings? In a matter so far beyond our reasoning it is most reverent to point to the mystery of another prayer (Matt. xxvi. 39) offered by Him who had often taught His disciples that He *must* be put to death (Matt. xvi. 21). Mark the striking correspondence between the petition thus understood and St. Peter's quotation of Ps. xvi. 10 (Acts ii. 24). Some of the expressions in this verse would lead us to believe that the writer's thought is resting on the Agony in the Garden; but the 'strong cry' brings before us the Crucifixion (Matt. xxviii. 46, 50), and the words of Ps. xxii. 1 lie very near the thought of this verse. It does not seem necessary to decide—we may doubt whether it is possible, and whether both should not be included. The opening words, 'in the days of His flesh' (comp. chap. ii. 14; John i. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 18), would certainly seem to favour this latter view. The word 'offered' must not be lightly passed over. Of frequent occurrence in this Epistle, in every case except one (which is not at all in point), it has a sacrificial sense; it seems certain, therefore, that these prayers—a token of His suffering, an example of His reverent fear—are included in the sacrifice which comprised His whole life and death."

Before reading this commentary we had been persuaded by the nervous exposition of Delitzsch that "to save Him from death" meant what our expositor declines to receive. The German exegete has a most impressive discussion of the subject, the result of which may be thus condensed: "The hearing vouchsafed to Him did not consist in a mere deliverance from that dread of death which made submission to it so hard; although this was doubtless in part a fruit of that agonising prayer (the great antitype of Jacob's wrestling), for what Christ prayed for was a deliverance from death itself, to which the only answer could have been a real deliverance. But if His prayer before death was that, if possible, He might escape it altogether, a subsequent resurrection and exaltation,

however glorious, could not be called an answer to such a prayer. If we considered Jesus as a mere man, His prayer would be to be kept from the death with which His enemies threatened Him; and in that case it would, especially the more earnest supplicatory part of it, be incomprehensible, seeing how many just men have met with joy the doom of the martyr, to suffer for God being itself a most blessed suffering. And if, as we must, we consider Jesus as the God-man and Mediator, then it would at first sight seem almost blasphemous to suppose that He could have sought to withdraw Himself from the work of atonement, at the point of its final accomplishment. . . . It was the whole abyss of death itself into which the Lord looked down when He offered this supplication. He saw there, not only the workings of evil men and of the demon-prince of death, but also of the ultimate ground of death, which is no other than the wrath of God Himself. . . . The Lord was heard, not by deliverance from the necessity of dying, but by temporal death being made for Him the gate of Paradise, and the cross of shame a ladder to heaven." But our own expositor's exhibition of this wonderful passage commands our best feeling. It is true that there is a terrible fascination about the interpretation of Delitzsch. We have only given a scanty account of it. Hardly in any pages can there be found so vivid and so uncompromising a statement of vicarious obedience and sacrifice as in the solemn pages of the German commentator. We confess, however, that we find a certain repose in the tranquil exposition in this volume. It carries conviction with it. Dr. Moulton quotes Lünemann: "The disposition of obedience Jesus possessed before He suffered, but the proof that this disposition existed must be shown in deed; this progress from the disposition to the deed of obedience is a practical learning of the virtue of obedience." Here as often a great difficulty is best met, indeed met in the only possible way, by the expression of a formula which carefully puts it into words; especially if that formula is so constructed as to obviate error. But we cannot help feeling that there is strong emphasis in the article before Obedience. There may be no grammatical ground for such an assertion. But there is strong theological ground for it. "Apart from sin!" we have had already. Here we want it again. The great obedience, "even unto death, even the death of the cross," had nothing to do with the suppression of a feeling that might have resisted; and is, therefore, unlike the obedience which we all must render.

As He learnt what the obedience to the Father's will was which wrought our redemption, so we must obey Him as the Divine Redeemer Himself.

Our expositor does not turn aside—if indeed it would be a turning aside—to defend the sacrificial expiatory ideas of the Epistle from perversion: either the gross perversion with which Dr. Jowett has made us familiar, or those more refined qualifications of the doctrine of the atonement which in their ultimate principle deny the existence of wrath in God. The law of this commentary is not polemical; and we have no right to expect from it what it does not promise. But the truth is here in all its rigour. The following extract from the analysis given on ch. ix. 11, 12, is deeply suggestive:

“By means of this assumption of human nature He received power to become High Priest, power also to become Himself the sin-offering. Once before only in the Epistle have we read of this twofold relation of our Lord to the sacrificial act. There it is mentioned parenthetically (chap. vii. 26) and by anticipation; here it is the leading thought (verses 14, 26, 28, chap. x. 10, *et. al.*). The efficacy of this offering is taken up again in verses 13, 14; the entering into the Holiest Place, in the latter part of the chapter. A new thought is introduced in the last words of this verse, ‘having won eternal redemption.’ Through the sacrifice atonement has been made and sin expiated: the blessing won, which in chap. 9 is called eternal salvation (see note on chap. vii. 25), is here ‘eternal redemption.’ The latter figure enlarges the former by the additional thought of the payment of a price. The deliverance of man from God's wrath and the penalty of sin, which Jesus effected by means of the offering of Himself, is ‘the eternal redemption which He won’ (see verse 14, and Eph. i. 7). The words ‘for us’ are not in the text: they are too intimately present in the whole thought to need direct expression.”

Dr. Barry's note on Eph. i. 7 may be incidentally quoted as illustrating the fidelity of this volume. But we must give only a few sentences from it. “The primary idea in ‘redemption’ is deliverance from a bondage, mostly the bondage of sin itself; occasionally (and in this sense with a different Greek word) the bondage under sentence of punishment for sin. Into that bondage man has plunged himself; God's mercy redeems him from it at an unspeakable price. The primary idea in the forgiveness of sins through His blood is propitiation, that is, the offering to God ‘a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice’ for it, by One who is the Head and Representative of the human race.” We could wish that the leading terms belong-

ing to the New-Testament theology of the Atonement were oftener explained in this manner throughout the volume. Their meaning is taken for granted sometimes when their interpretation would be very expedient.

Noting the parenthesis as a caution ("There is no distinct reference in this Epistle to the 'scapegoat' sent into the wilderness"), we pause on the exposition of "Sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh . . . Better, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh. As we have seen already (verse 10), the writer is looking at the intrinsic character of the sacrifices (ch. x. 4) and rites of purification, apart from their importance, as marks of obedience or their value to those who were able to discern their spiritual lessons. They could not cleanse the conscience (verse 9); but they could and did remove what the law accounted 'uncleanness,' and disabilities connected with the outward life and religious worship of the commonwealth." Here it would have been useful to dilate on what is a cardinal principle in the exposition of the Epistle: the relation of the typical to the real purification. An examination of other notes will supply what we desire; but at this point many confused minds would have been glad if these two good sentences had been expanded. But this leads to verse fourteen, where we have a note that challenges remark.

"*Through the Eternal Spirit . . . Better, through an Eternal Spirit* ; for in a passage of so much difficulty it is important to preserve the exact rendering of the Greek, and the arguments usually adduced seem insufficient to justify the ordinary translation. By most readers of the Authorised Version, probably, these words are understood as referring to the Holy Spirit, whose influence continually rested on 'the anointed One of God' (Acts x. 38). For this opinion there seems to be no foundation in the usage of the New Testament, and it is not indicated by anything in the context. The explanation of the words must either be sought in the nature of our Lord, or in some attribute of that nature. There are a few passages, mainly in the Epistles of St. Paul, in which language somewhat similar (*pneuma*) of our Lord. The most remarkable of these are (Rom. i. 4) where 'spirit of holiness' is placed in contrast with 'flesh,' and (1 Tim. iii. 16) in 'spirit.' On the latter Bishop Ellicott writes: 'In *spirit*, in the higher sphere of His divine life: the *pneuma* of Christ is not here the Holy Spirit, but the *higher principle* of spiritual life, which was not the Divinity (this would be an Apollinarian assertion); but especially and intimately united with it.' (Another passage of great interest is 1 Pet. iii. 18.) The attribute 'eternal' is explained by chap. vii. 18, 19, 'accord-

ing to power of indissoluble life (He hath become priest), for of Him it is testified, Thou art a priest for ever.' Through this spirit, a spirit of holiness, a spirit of indissoluble life, He offered Himself to God. This made such a self-offering possible; this gave to the offering infinite worth. In the words which stand in contrast with these (verse 13) we read of the death of animals which had no power over their own transient life: He who was typified in every high priest and in every victim, 'through an eternal spirit,' of Himself laid down His life (John x. 18), offering Himself to God in the moment and article of death—offered Himself in His constant presence in the Holiest Place (verse 24)."

There are formidable difficulties surrounding any interpretation of these words. But that which is here adopted seems a not perfectly satisfactory attempt to remove them. It seems to imply that "the higher principle of spiritual life"—for we are really dealing with Bishop Ellicott in this stricture—however allied to the Divinity, could never be the agent in the oblation of Himself. It was that very spirit in the flesh which He offered without spot. What gave the offering infinite worth was not the spirit induced by union with the Divinity with indissoluble life, but the Eternal Spirit of His Divinity itself. There is no Apollinarianism in this; for it does not deny the existence of the human spirit, which was really the precious offering itself. The question arises whether New-Testament usage will allow the Divine nature of our Lord to be termed Eternal Spirit. We see no reason to shrink from asserting that it will. Spirit is—to speak reverently—the generic definition of God, of all that is called God, of God in each of the Three Holy Persons. In Rom. i. 4 the "Spirit of holiness" is the Divine nature as correlated with the human; for certainly the "flesh" with which it is there contrasted cannot be the human nature of our Lord without its "spirit." As to the passage, 1 Pet. iii. 18, we shall make a remark hereafter, suggested by the commentary on that passage. It is indeed the only one in which the Redeemer's Flesh and Spirit, His Divine and human natures, cannot be understood without some violence. In the present passage He is said to have "offered Himself;" and it seems impossible to doubt that behind the great oblation was that personality of the Eternal Son, without which there could be no Offering and no Offerer. The present exposition accepts this, doubtless, and asserts it in the words "especially and intimately united with it;" but the prominence given to the "spirit" of our Lord seems, on the whole, a needless

complication. Of course, we remember the apt dictum of that earlier note, "the glory which 'becomes' His is proportionate to and consonant with the name that is His by essential right," which has its application here, as indeed very often in this Epistle. The sanctified spirit of our Lord might be said to present the oblation which could in very truth be given only by the Eternal Son and received only from Him. But the doubt always returns upon us whether the "higher principle of spiritual life" in the spirit of the Redeemer is either a conceivable or a scriptural idea in this connection.

The reference to 1 Pet. iii. 18 suggests the interesting exposition of this passage and the entire context in Mr. Mason's commentary. Mr. Mason dismisses as untenable the translation "quickened by the Spirit," and any reference to the resurrection as such, or to the Holy Spirit as the agent in the raising of our Lord. He observes: "It would not be possible to follow Ecumenius, Calvin, Beza, and Leighton in taking the flesh to mean generally the human nature of Christ, and 'the Spirit' by which He was quickened to mean His own Divine nature; for Christ has a human spirit as truly as a human body and soul, and it would be heresy to call His Divine nature His Spirit, as though it occupied in Him the position which is occupied in men by the human spirit. But, as a matter of fact, we cannot translate it 'quickened by the Spirit.' It is literally *killed indeed in flesh, but quickened in spirit*. Now how can 'quickened in spirit' be a description of the Resurrection?" It would be heresy to call the Divine nature His Spirit on the assumption that "the flesh" here means only the body and soul of our Lord: which we have the greatest repugnance in admitting, indeed cannot by any means admit. There is but one Person referred to, and that in His two natures. He was put to death—*killed* we must be permitted to refuse—as to His human nature, His spirit being not indeed in one sense put to death, but included in the effects of the death notwithstanding. It was with respect to or in the sphere of His flesh that the Lord underwent the suffering of death; and it was with respect to His higher nature or its sphere that He, the same Jesus, was made alive. As Mr. Mason says, "in" is "often used to mean 'in the power of,' 'on the strength of.'" The putting to death and the quickening seem to mean generally the atoning passion on the one hand and the victorious effect of it on the other. It is

somewhat like St. Paul's "died and lived again" in Rom. xiv. Our Lord in His one person received death in His flesh, including His spirit, though the term flesh is alone appropriate here; in His one person He received life from that death at the very instant of suffering it, because as God He could not be holden of it. But in this latter case the term spirit is used to signify both the Divinity that maintained His continuous life and the sphere of His human nature in which alone for a season that life was manifested. The effects of the manifestation were felt by the spirits in prison. Unless we mistake his meaning, Mr. Mason hovers round this interpretation: "as a matter of fact, there is nothing in the words to suggest an interval between the quickening and the putting to death;" "actually quickened to fresh energies in spirit by that very death." But he objects to take the word as meaning "preserved alive," though "a word" almost identical is apparently used in that sense in Luke xvii. 33; Acts vii. 19. He objects to it because "some energetic action seems required to balance 'being put to death.'" Surely the word itself is energetic enough: it signifies the whole energy of the Divine life that in death abolished death. Hence, we are very suspicious of the analogy here drawn between Christ's experience and ours. The "also" is, as we think, in this and in the neighbouring passages unduly pressed. Nor can we receive the thought here introduced from Bengel and others, that "the spirit, set free from the body, immediately receives new life, as it were, thereby." There is no room for this "as it were" in the strong word. It can hardly refer to the human spirit of our Lord at all; that spirit as such had not succumbed to death, and was not revived; nor, on the other hand, was it in death merely strengthened in its energy.

We have glided almost unconsciously into the exposition of the First Epistle of St. Peter; which is the liveliest and the most racy—though by no means the safest—in the volume. It is not within our scope to pursue these remarks; suffice that we only do our duty when we advise the reader to receive cautiously some of the things here said. As to the general scheme of interpretation on the contested passages we think Mr. Mason unassailable. But in ch. iv. 6 there is some very strange exposition. For instance: "There is a whole set of passages which seems to teach that resurrection—i.e., the permanent restitution of life to the body—is a gift which does not belong to all. To those who eat Christ's

flesh, He promises, 'I will raise him up at the last day.' St. Paul suffers the loss of all things, 'if by any means he may attain to the resurrection of the dead.' Our Lord bids the Apostles 'fear Him [it is doubtful whether He means God, or Satan, who acts by God's permission] who is able to destroy both soul [He does not say "spirit"] and body in hell.' So it would be the simplest explanation of our present text if we might believe that these Antediluvians were to be deprived of resurrection of the flesh which they had so foully corrupted, but in God's mercy, through accepting the Gospel preached to them by Christ after their death, were to be allowed a purely spiritual existence." Here is a modification of a theory with which we have been made familiar. Mr. Mason does not give us the other and opposite "set of passages."

Turning, for a moment, to another subject, many of Mr. Mason's sentences concerning the atoning work of our Lord are not distinguished by the care which is never absent from the exposition of the Hebrews, nor by the high doctrine which the Editor's works give us. It is not that these sentences are themselves wrong; but there is something in their tone and in their omissions that seems hardly fair to the true doctrine of the New Testament. "St. Peter says not a word about the Atonement in its effect upon the mind of the Father towards man, though there is, no doubt, some deep truth in the phrase which occurs in the second of the Thirty-nine Articles—'suffered . . . to reconcile His Father to us': it is a side on which the New-Testament writers do not much dwell. It is too high a mystery for our minds to reach. The phrase is itself not Scriptural. The New Testament, as has been well pointed out, never even speaks of the reconciliation as *mutual*. The quarrel is treated as onesided, so far, at least, as in connection with the Atonement. When, then, our Lord was put to death as a sacrifice for sins—a righteous man on behalf of unrighteous men—St. Peter explains these terms by the expression 'in order that He might bring you to God,' not 'in order that he might bring God to you.' The voluntary death of a righteous man upon the cross, in the calm calculation that nothing else would so attract sinful man to Himself, and thus to the Father who sent Him—this is the aspect of the Atonement which St. Peter sets forth." We confess that there is something here which we do not like: in this "calm calculation" we do not feel at home. As to the great underlying question of a mutual reconciliation, the exceedingly

peremptory assertions of this expositor must be controlled by the luminous disquisitions of eminent exegetes on the other side, with Fritzsche and Meyer among them: "among them," we say, for these exegetes have very many on their side, though they, perhaps, have gone most fully into the subject. Mr. Mason might complain, perhaps, that we have not finished his sentence. It runs on thus, and the apology is as grave as the offence: "Perhaps on another occasion he might have set forth a different aspect; but now he is still thinking of the effect of Christian conduct upon the outer world, and his object is to make the Christians feel that they too can, in their measure, bring the unjust, the persecuting heathens and Jews, to God by innocent and voluntary deaths. Thus their deaths are carrying on the work of reconciliation; and what Christ did for them ('died for you') they do for others. Well, then, may they be called blessed when they suffer." Again we say how much we deprecate the tone of such remarks. In the note preceding this there is the same want, as we think, of theological vigilance. Granted that we are doing injustice to the writer by extracting certain sentences: such sentences as these hardly ought to be there at all. "If, therefore, Christ *also* was put to death as a sin-offering, it is implied that, in a sense, the Christian martyr is also a sin-offering, and (though in an infinitely lower degree) dies, like Him, 'just for unjust.'" Again: "As a substitute for the unjust, we make bold to say that (according to Holy Scripture, the primitive fathers, and the conscience of man) neither the martyrs nor Christ Himself could have made atonement; 'on behalf of' other men, the martyrs could very easily be said to die. It is, perhaps, a pity that the definite article has been inserted in our version. Though, of course, our Lord is the only human being who can in strictness be called just, St. Peter means the word here to cover others besides Him; 'Christ *also* died, a just man on behalf of unjust men.'" Because EVEN Christ! We have a profound sympathy with much that is said here and in the cluster of notes on this subject: so far, that is, as they contain a noble protest against exaggeration of the doctrine of substitution. But the middle path is not found in such statements. However, we must turn to our present subject, quite sure that we shall enter again a region where strict watchfulness reigns.

Returning to Dr. Moulton, it would be pleasant to follow his guidance through many other difficulties of the Epistle: such as the question between "covenant" and "testament;" the

"First Principles;" the "Renewing unto Repentance," with its parallels; and many others. We can only promise the reader much profit in the careful study of this exposition on all these points. There is one note, however, to which we must call attention as singularly valuable. It ought to be inserted as it stands; but space permits only a slight reproduction of its substance. It is that on the definition or description of Faith at the head of the eleventh chapter. "It is not a complete definition, in the sense of including all the moments of thought which are present in the word as used in the last chapter (verse 38) or in this. The 'things hoped for' are not mere figments of the imagination: their basis is *the word of God*. If we keep this in mind, the words, still remaining general in their form, agree with all that has led up to them and with all that follows; and whether they be called definition or description will be of little consequence." The word rendered "substance" has in ch. i. 3 its true meaning: the essence which "stands under" the qualities possessed. In ch. iii. 14 the same metaphor of *standing under* is applied to steadfastness, confidence (see the note). In the rendering "substance" of the present passage, our version has deserted the earlier translations to follow the Rhenish. But the sense is not very clear: the symmetry of the verse seems to require a word which denotes an act or attitude of the mind. But the analogy of the second member of the verse seems to be in favour of the rendering, "Faith is the giving substance to things hoped for:" *in regard to ourselves* they may be said not yet to exist, belonging to the future. In the second clause the Greek word denotes putting to the test, examining for the purpose of proof, bringing to conviction. The word "things," found in the second but not in the first clause, reminds us of the *reality* of the unseen. The whole verse, then, may be rendered "Now faith is the giving substance to what is hoped for, the testing of things not seen." It might appear that the context, both before and after, requires the notion of steadfast endurance to be more prominent in the meaning of the word; but, strictly speaking, that is exhibited throughout the chapter rather as the result than as the strict sense of the idea expressed there by "substance." This seems to be our expositor's judgment, for he thus sums up: "And now, passing away from the general aspect of the words to that in which they are presented by the context, we have as the meaning: Faith, holding to God's word, gives substance to what the word promises, investing the

future blessings with a present existence, treating them as if already objects of sight rather than of hope. Through faith, guided by the same word, the things unseen are brought to the proof; what that word teaches, though future, or though belonging to a world beyond human sight, is received with full conviction." The history of the interpretation of this passage is a very interesting one. Some expositors hold much to the meaning of the word "substance" in ch. i. 3, and would make faith itself the very substance in germ of all that is promised: as we already have the Son and life in Him. Others cling to the meaning which the word obviously bears in ch. iii. 14: Faith bears up in the soul the whole weight of hoped-for realities. The interpretation given in this volume does really, though not professedly, combine the two; and, however much the principle of combining meanings may be condemned, it certainly has on its side the advantage of making the three applications of the term in this Epistle, in a certain sense, one. Faith gives substantial reality for the time being to what is only matter of hope: the substance it gives is not merely objective, but a real possession, trusted in and relied upon to the uttermost. Finally, let the reader—guided by Bengel's profound note—apply the definition of ver. 1 to any passage in the chapter, and he will see how admirably it adapts itself, as here interpreted in both its parts, to all that follows. For instance, let him take the case of Noah, which we single out for the sake of the admirable note: "This righteousness is looked upon as an inheritance, received by all who manifest the faith. In this place the righteousness is connected with faith, as in the writings of St. Paul, but with a change of figure. It is not looked upon as arising out of faith (Rom. x. 6), or as resting on the condition of faith (Phil. iii. 9), or as obtained by means of faith (Rom. iii. 22), but as corresponding with faith, or answering to it. There is no important difference of thought; but the idea of a continuous inheritance, answering to continuous faith, is very strikingly presented here." Here we have "from" faith, "on" faith, "by" faith, followed by "according to faith." But, apart from this, bring the former clause of the definition to bear, and refreshing is the result.

Passing by the discussion of "the sin which doth so easily beset us"—where, for once, Dr. Moulton declines to help us thoroughly out of our difficulty—we mark the allusion to Jesus as an example of faith, in the note on ch. xii. 2. It is questionable whether "Author" contrasted with "Per-

fector" of faith will allow the example that follows literally to include faith: the text does not say so. But this is only matter of definition and caution. The note on ch. xiii. 8, with its striking translation, ought in our humble judgment to be raised to a higher pitch as the counterpart at the end of that sublime beginning, ch. i. 11, 12, to the noble comment on which it refers. But when we treat of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is the sacrifice we ought to close with; and here is our last quotation, a very instructive one to all preachers:

"We need not such profitless teaching; we already have sustenance which is 'meat indeed,' by which the heart is established. According to the Law the priests (they who 'serve the Tabernacle,' see chap. viii. 5) received for themselves a greater or smaller portion of the animals offered as peace-offerings and trespass-offerings; in some cases, also, the flesh of the sin-offerings fell to their lot (Lev. iv., v., vii., xxiii.). When the high priest presented a sin-offering on his own behalf (Lev. iv. 3—12), or for the congregation (verses 13—21), he sprinkled some of the blood in the holy place in front of the veil; on the day of atonement alone was the blood taken within the veil into the most holy place. In the case of these three offerings the priest received no part of the animal sacrificed; certain portions were burnt on the altar of burnt-offering, and the rest of the body was carried forth 'without the camp,' and wholly consumed by fire. Though the writer here speaks of animals whose blood is brought into *the holy place* through the high priest, as an offering for sin, it is probable that (as in chaps. v.—ix.) he has in thought the day of atonement only, so that here 'the holy place' bears the sense of the 'holiest of all' (see note on chap. ix. 2). (It will be noted that throughout he uses the present tense; see the same note.) For us there is but one sacrifice for sin, the efficacy of which endures for ever (chap. x. 12); Jesus entering the holiest place for us in virtue of His own sacrifice has fulfilled the type contained in the high priest's sprinkling of the blood. But whereas these priests might not eat of their sin-offering, to us greater privilege is given; we feed on Him who was slain for us, whose flesh was for the life of the world (John vi. 51—56). We then (who are all 'priests unto God') 'have an altar of which,' on the very principles of their law, 'they that serve the Tabernacle (see chap. viii. 5) have no right to eat.' The stress is laid on the *sacrifice*, of which we eat, not upon the altar itself. If separately interpreted, the altar will be the place of sacrifice, the cross."

We feel, as we read, that this is close and severe exposition. The writer does not allow himself for a moment to forget that he has only to give the sense. As he never turns

aside to refute heresies, does not tarry to deduce consequences from the truth, so he suppresses—as far, that is, as a Christian writer can—all expression of his own emotion, or appeal to emotion in his readers. One might suppose that “We have an altar!” would dissolve the rigorous bonds, especially as the Epistle is drawing to its close. We expect the relaxation further on when that heavenly prayer comes in; but our expositor even there leaves our hearts to do their own work. And returning to the point where the quotation ends, the “bearing His reproach” is expounded with strict reference to the original application of the words. “The sin-offering was burned *without the camp*. Jesus, who in all other points fulfilled the law of atonement, fulfilled it in this point also, in that He suffered “without the gate” (Matt. xxvii. 32; John xix. 20). The two expressions answer to one another, each denoting that which lay beyond the sacred precincts, outside the special dwelling-place of God’s people. “The people,” see chap. ii. 17; “sanctify,” chaps. ii. 11; ix. 13; x. 10. And again: “The suffering ‘without the gate’ was a symbol of His rejection by the Jews. All who would be His must share the reproach which came upon Him who was cast out by His people and crucified (chap. xi. 26); they also must go forth ‘without the camp,’ forsaking the company of His foes. Each one must for himself make choice either of the synagogue, or of the Church of Christ; between the two there can be no fellowship.” We must accept the stern principle of modern exegesis; and have no doubt that on the whole its sternness is an advantage. At any rate, it is much better than the opposite extreme with which we are only too familiar. We do not expect a devotional commentary in a work like this, and therefore we must not complain.

We cannot lay down this Exposition without giving expression to a wish that has occurred to us again and again while reading it, that Dr. Moulton should find time to edit an edition of the Greek text, with a commentary constructed on the principle of Dr. Vaughan’s noble experiment on the Epistle to the Romans. It strikes us that there is no document of the New Testament which offers a finer field for the application of the Greek Testament and Septuagint Concordance to the elucidation of the text. Men who have read and profited by Dr. Vaughan’s work, and have felt grateful to him for his indefatigable pains in introducing the parallels in the original Greek, will know what we mean. Those who

note how often Dr. Moulton traces the terms of his text in their use elsewhere, and with what advantage to his exposition he does this, will agree with us that he could render great service by accomplishing such a task. If space allowed, and we did not incur the danger of entering too wide a field and of being lost in it, we might illustrate this by examples from the first word translated "person" downwards. Of our expositor's peculiar qualifications—we use only this adjective as he may be one of our readers—it is needless to speak.

But this rises to a larger suggestion. The Methodist people want a commentary on the whole Bible, to occupy the place so long and so well occupied by others which can no longer hold their ground. There is]no more imperative need than this. It may be said that universal commentaries abound already, and that they are increasing. To this it is obvious to reply that the readers also abound, and that the demand comes with strongest force from those who know and who use most of those commentaries. Canon Norris says in the preface to his *New Testament*: "I make no apology for adding to the number of books of a like sort. For, great as the supply is, the demand is still greater." Why could not Dr. Moulton take the position of a general editor of such a work, and organise his staff, and see what resources he has at his command, and consecrate his own time and that of many who might not be unworthy to co-operate, to the production of what would be an unlimited boon to a very large part of Christendom dispersed over the face of the whole earth? This is not a suggestion thrown out as an ideal not capable of realisation, or not likely to be realised if attempted. There are no insuperable difficulties in the way. The number of writers need not be many; though the day for sole authorship in this province is past for ever, the authorship of six or seven may not be found impracticable. Very much of the matter of such a commentary would be found already at hand: we mean that common fund of expository matter which belongs to any one who will use it, being the property of none in particular. A weightier objection might be the questionableness of attempting an exposition of the whole Bible under the impress and influence of a system of faith and ecclesiastical tradition so definite and so marked as that of the Methodist people. But, closely examined, that objection disappears. Every community has its catechism and other standards of doctrine; and in some form or other almost every community has its commentaries. The real difficulty would be the

creation of such a work under such conditions as would admit of Connexional sanction. This difficulty would, we are bound to believe, disappear also. There is a difference between accepting and issuing such a work as a formal and authorised expression of the mind of the Body on the meaning of the Word of God, and such a more general acceptance and recommendation as would ensure its wide diffusion. To return to the writers. It has pleased God to raise up men capable of doing this work under good guidance. Some are known; others soon will be known. By skilful handling a much larger number of contributories than six or seven might be made to work harmoniously; and all who should be found worthy of this most sacred service would be more ready to make great sacrifices of self for the common good, and co-operate regardless of their own particular fame.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

LEGGE'S RELIGIONS OF CHINA.

The Religions of China: Confucianism and Taoism Described and Compared with Christianity. By James Legge, Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

THE writer of this volume is well known as unrivalled among living sinologues, and his readers may well expect to find in it an accurate treatment of the interesting subject undertaken. For upwards of forty years he has been a painstaking and successful student of the Chinese language and literature. He spent nearly the whole of this period as an agent of the London Missionary Society in China, but for the last four or five years he has been Professor of Chinese at Oxford. *The Religions of China* consists of four lectures, delivered, during the spring of the present year, in the College of the Presbyterian Church of England, Guilford Street, London. These religions are commonly spoken of as three, viz.: Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Professor Legge, however, confines the attention of his readers to the two former, and in so doing he is right; for while Buddhism in China numbers among its adherents untold millions, and these from among all classes, and has by its peculiar dogmas and vagaries affected disastrously the native religions, it is not indigenous to the soil, but an importation from India. If Dr. Legge, or some other equally gifted sinologist, would give, in lectures or otherwise, an exhaustive account of the theories and fortunes of Buddhism in China he would confer a boon on all who are interested in the welfare of that land.

The first and second lectures before us are on Confucianism. This most ancient of the Chinese religions is so called not because Confucius was the founder of it, but because he was the most

illustrious of its exponents. He claimed to be "a transmitter and not a maker."

In an early part of the first lecture the learned author, by an analysis of sundry primitive characters, directed the attention of his hearers to some of the earliest notions of the Chinese about God and spiritual beings. The institution and mode of worship addressed to God and deceased ancestors are referred to. And it is quite refreshing to find in two of their oldest books frequent reference to the unity, personality, omnipotence, omniscience, and justice of God. In fact the *Shû** and the *Shih*† are a mine whence Christian missionaries may dig out many a precious gem with which to illustrate the teachings of revelation as to the Divine nature and government.

In the course of the first lecture some paragraphs are devoted to divination as practised in Ancient China. Specimens of prayer addressed to God at the solstitial services, in summer and winter, are also furnished. "The offerings at these services are oblations, and not propitiatory sacrifices. The idea of substitution is not unknown in Chinese history, but it has no place in the religious services." These semi-annual services are an acknowledgment by the emperor, for himself, his dynasty, and the nation, of their obligations to God.

In the second lecture, after dwelling on the worship of parents and ancestors and the departed great—including "those who had legislated for the people, those who had died in the diligent discharge of their duties, those whose toils had established states, and those who had warded off, or given succour in, great calamities"—the Confucian doctrine about man is introduced. From this we learn that man is the creature of God. As to his nature it is said, "Man is the most intelligent of all creatures." Confucius said, "Man is born for uprightness; and that, if one be without uprightness, and yet live, his escape (from death) is the result of mere good fortune." "Man's nature is good," said Mencius.‡ "The tendency of man's nature to good is like the tendency of water to flow downwards." At the same time he admitted "that man was prone to go astray, and could not be safely left to himself." The course of human duty, according to these sages, is confined to the five constituent relations of society. These relations are those between ruler and subject, father and son, husband and wife, elder brother and younger, friend and

* The *Shû King*, is a compilation of historical documents, and the oldest of Chinese books.

† The *Shih King*, or book of ancient poetry, stands next, as to antiquity, to the *Shû*.

‡ Mencius was a philosopher of the Confucian school, and was born in B.C. 371, about 107 years after the death of Confucius. His mental vigour and grasp surpassed that of the great sage himself.

friend. The Confucian scheme of doctrine says nothing about men's duty to God. Before passing from the nature and duty of man to his destiny, two sections are employed in describing the position of woman, infanticide, and foot-binding.

As to man's state after death, Confucianism gives no very explicit utterance. It holds that, though man be disembodied, he continues to live: in fact, ancestral worship supposes the independent existence of the human soul. Rewards and dignity are allotted to the good after death, but nothing is said about any punishment for the bad. It would seem, however, that the tyrant-oppressor, after death, may be prayed to as much as if he had been a great benefactor of the people. For "one of the finest poems in the Shih is a prayer by King Hsüan of the ninth century B.C. in a time of excessive drought. He prays to his parents for succour, though his father had been notoriously worthless and wicked." The doctrine of retribution as now held by Chinese scholars has relation only to time. "Virtue and vice have their appropriate issues, if not in the experience of the individual, certainly in that of his posterity." This division of the second lecture is closed by the quotation of four sayings of Confucius on the topic before us.

There now follows a sketch of the life of Confucius. Born in B.C. 551, he commenced his labours as a teacher in his twenty-second year, three years after marriage. His house became a resort, not for schoolboys, but for young and inquiring spirits who wished to increase their knowledge of the history and doctrines of the past. "However small the fee that was given he never refused his instructions; but he did require an ardent desire for improvement and some degree of capacity. He was in office under his prince for a brief period only, and after a life of vicissitude and disappointment—disappointment that no monarch arose willing to govern his state on the principles which he enunciated—he passed away in B.C. 478, in the seventy-third of his age. His end was affecting and melancholy, for "he uttered no prayer, and he betrayed no apprehension." His disciples buried him with extraordinary pomp, and many of them built huts, and remained mourning near his grave, as for a father, for three years. Soon after his removal the great ones of the nation, who had neglected him and his counsels while living, began to acknowledge his merit, and to build temples and offer worship to him. In A.D. 57 there was commenced what has been continued ever since, the offering to him of sacrifices in the Government colleges throughout the country. He is worshipped now twice in the year, during spring and autumn. At these seasons the Emperor goes in state to the Imperial College in Peking to worship the great Sage.

The third lecture is on Tãoism. The name Tãoism is derived

from the first word in a remarkable treatise called the *Tào Teh King*, written in the sixth century B.C. by *Lão-tsze*. Three English words—the Way, Reason, and the Word may each be regarded as the equivalent of *Tào*. The lecturer gives his preference to “the Way, in the sense of method.” “*Tào* is the style of action which *Lão-tsze* wished to recommend and inculcate—action proceeding from a mind in a state of calm repose, according to the spontaneity of its nature, without bias of partiality and hypocrisy.” Hence *Tào* is not the name of a person, but of a concept, or idea; and *Tàoism* does not owe its name to its author, as Buddhism and some other religions do. The word has two different applications; it is the name both of a religion and a philosophy. It has a legal standing, is officially recognised, and its chief is endowed. It boasts a long line of Popes, or Patriarchs. The headship of this religion has been in the *Chang* family, with the exception of one period of interruption, since the first century of our era. The spirit of the first Pope is supposed to have transmigrated from one chief to another down to the present time. Something like this obtains, we believe, with regard to the Grand Lamas of Thibet. But whether one has adopted the theory from the other, and if so, which, it would be hard to say. “*Tàoism*, as a religion, did not exist until a considerable time after the beginning of the Christian era. It is polytheistic. Its development in this direction is greatly owing to the influence of Indian Buddhism. The illustrations on this point are very interesting, but we have no space for them. Before Buddhism was introduced into China *Tàoism* was a mass of superstitions and sacrifices not digested into any system. One of the emperors, in the second century B.C., under the teaching of this religion, engaged in alchemical studies, and attempted to transform cinnabar and other substances into gold. He believed that the medicine of immortality might be obtained, and that the immortals might be made to appear. He also accepted their teachings as to astrology, as he did their alchemy, their herb and elixir of immortality. The state gods of China are, many of them, the creation of the *Tàoist* imagination, and their temples are in the hands of the priests of *Tào*.”

The purgatory and hell of this religion afford scope for the wildest imagination and most unbridled fancy. *Tàoism* lays claim to all but unlimited power in its profession of magic, especially in conflict with malevolent spirits. It has its superstition of geomancy, a superstition which stands in the way of the moral and material elevation of China. We have no space to touch on *Tàoism* as a philosophy, and can only just enumerate the points of comparison instituted between Confucianism and *Tàoism* on the one hand, and Christianity on the other.

The existence of God, the possibility and fact of revelation,

the idea of the supernatural, are preliminary points of agreement in the three religions. But when regard is had to the nature and worship of God we find the advantage all on the side of Christianity. Comparison is further traced in the filial piety, in the teaching of morality, and the place of woman in the three religions. The Christian doctrine of the death of Christ is dwelt on, and also its disclosures of a future punishment; and we are glad to observe that the learned lecturer gives in his adhesion to what is known as the orthodox view on this doctrine. In conclusion the old missionary has some last words on the practical issues of the four lectures. He pleads that as we now know the great need of China is Christianity, more labourers may be sent forth into this great harvest field, and that all professors of Christianity would exhibit Christlike attributes of character; and that this should be the case, especially in all our intercourse with China, whether commercial or political. We cordially recommend the volume as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the Chinese mode of thinking on religious subjects.

PHELPS'S OLD TESTAMENT A LIVING BOOK.

The Old Testament; a Living Book for all Ages. By Austin Phelps, D.D., Professor at Andover Theological Seminary. Author of "The Still Hour," &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1879.

JUDGING from the quantity of literature of this class that annually finds its way into the market, one might suppose that sermons supplied very pleasant and profitable matter to the reading public. And yet it is difficult to reconcile this conclusion with the disparaging criticism one often hears upon discourses delivered from the pulpit. Is it that only those of the highest class are committed to print, and that the average homily preached in our churches and chapels, week by week, sinks below the standard necessary for publication? We are not prepared to accept this explanation, for certainly many of the sermons we hear are vastly superior to some which are eagerly read. It must, however, be admitted that most sermons that are widely read possess qualities which are suited to modern taste and habits, but which are not always present in the pulpit utterances of the highest class. In these days men have neither time nor patience for sermons of Puritan calibre and proportions. Great length and great depth are fatal to popularity. Literature of the light and ephemeral type has ruined the taste for more solid productions. The question, then, which all ministers of the Gospel should strive to answer in a practical way is, How is the Divine ordinance of preaching to be turned to the best account in the present day as a means of religious instruction? It is useless to

protest against popular taste, or to indulge in satirical reflections upon the average hearer of sermons. Still less is it wise of preachers to ignore the wishes and capacities of the majority of their audience, and to flatter themselves that the more cultured appreciate their utterances, and that, therefore, the rest are not worth considering. If the pulpit is to hold its place as a great religious power, it must be adapted to the requirements of the age; and no preaching fulfils that condition that leaves the great bulk of a congregation untouched. Of this adaptation we have a good specimen in the pages of Dr. Austin Phelps.

The title of his book conveys a good idea of his design. He believes that history is perpetually repeating itself, and that principles that are fundamental and eternal are illustrated in all ages of the world. He has selected a number of incidents from the Old Testament, and sought in each case to indicate some underlying truth, which he shows to be applicable to the present day. In the whole twenty-four sermons there is great similarity of treatment: indeed, nearly every sermon seems to have been cast in the same mould. The title, in most instances, enunciates a moral principle, which Dr. Phelps illustrates in a series of propositions. The second sermon is a fair specimen of the whole. The text is 2 Chron. xx. 15, 17, and the subject of these verses is the prophecy of Jahaziel, in reference to the invasion of the Moabites and others. The title chosen for this discourse, viz., "God works with minorities who are working for Him," indicates a law which the writer conceives to be suggested by the historical incident referred to in the text. In seeking to establish his position Professor Phelps lays down and briefly considers the following propositions:—1. The history of the Church is full of illustrations of this law of Divine procedure. 2. From this law of God's working, it is clear that in spiritual affairs the balance of power does not depend on numbers. 3. It is a great thought on this subject, that the human race furnishes but a small part of the holy ministries of this world. 4. Success in spiritual affairs often loses the character of a conflict, so overwhelming and so easy is the working of Divine auxiliaries. 5. Minorities of honest and earnest men, devoted to a great cause, should never be opposed heedlessly. 6. Within the Church of Christ itself is to be found a minority of believers whom God regards with peculiar complacency.

The main defects and excellences of the volume are conspicuous in this sermon. The chief fault that we have to find is, that there is so little connection between the sermon and the text. If pulpit addresses were admissible without texts, we should have very little to say of this book but what is favourable, but we hold strongly to the opinion that it is unwise for a preacher to employ a passage of Scripture simply as the motto of a moral essay.

According to the best canons of preaching, these are really not sermons at all, but lectures on ethical subjects, many of which, we readily admit, are of great importance.

Again and again, in reading this volume, the question has occurred, would it be wise to adopt this mode of pulpit address on a large scale? There is so much that is instructive; such intense earnestness; such an evident desire to promote practical godliness, that we should like all the best characteristics of these discourses to be present in every sermon. At the same time, we gravely doubt the wisdom of substituting such a style of preaching for careful exposition of God's Word. There are very few topics that may not be brought before a congregation in unfolding and applying Scripture. We consider it a capital offence in a professor of a theological seminary to ignore such important matters as interpretation and exegesis.

We are persuaded that in the long run nothing will be so edifying to our congregations as careful explanation and application of Holy Scripture. Our commission is not to preach about the Word of God, but to preach the Word itself.

Notwithstanding the strictures we have felt compelled to make, there is much that is very admirable in this volume. Crying sins are denounced in merciless fashion. Withering scorn, keen invective, cutting satire, are employed to excellent purpose. The writer wields a most vigorous pen, and is master of a racy and pungent style. On every page there are passages almost epigrammatic in their point and force. The subjects are well adapted to the present day, and the matter is very fresh and original. One of the chief charms of these sermons is that they are thoroughly practical. They relate to matters which affect our everyday life in both hemispheres, although there are orthographical and other evidences of a decidedly American origin. No congregation would be likely to fall asleep while they were being delivered, and no hearer could charge the preacher with dealing in platitudes or studied ambiguities. There are some capital side-thrusts at modern scepticism; and doctrines of Holy Scripture, which have been recently assailed, are triumphantly vindicated.

No doubt some will regard the lack of evangelical sentiment as a defect. It should be remembered, however, that our author is dealing with Old-Testament subjects, and his special aim is to correct and regulate the practice of professed Christians. We have read the book with unflagging interest, and should be glad to see what so popular and powerful a writer could do in the way of sermons less topical and more decidedly textual.

HOMILETICAL AND PASTORAL LECTURES.

Homiletical and Pastoral Lectures. Delivered in St. Paul's.
With a Preface. By the Right Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D.
London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE present volume may be regarded as a sort of informal homiletics. In style and matter the different papers are only what might be expected from ministers of such high ability and wide experience as Archbishop Thomson, Bishop Thorold, Dean Perowne, Canon Barry, Prebendaries Macdonald and Cadman, and the other contributors. If through the variety of authorship the volume suffers from a want of unity and systematic completeness, as well as from a few repetitions, on the other hand the same cause imparts a freshness and manysidedness of treatment not usually found in the treatise of a single author. The different writers evidently draw direct from the fount of personal experience. Even the repetitions are valuable as indicating the points which the writers deem of greater importance. Thus, more than one writer insists upon the close relation of preaching excellence to the preacher's personal character. Canon Thorold says: "What the man is, the sermon will be; but the man is what his previous life has made him." Archbishop Thomson says: "I have ventured to think that good men sometimes preach bad sermons, but I do not forget that bad men will never preach good ones. Without real love of God and man, the congregation will at last discover that the warmth that perhaps for a moment deceived them is but the crackling of thorns under a pot, and the ornaments of speech are but as a wreath of artificial flowers round the livid face of a corpse. 'The only source of unction in preaching,' it has been well said, 'is the spirit of regeneration and grace. It is a gift that is spent and lost, unless we renew this sacred fire, which must always be kept burning; and that which preserves it is the cross within the soul—self-denial, prayer, and penitence.'" Here, above all, is the secret of good preaching—personal character. The sermon, like everything else a man does, will be the reflection of himself. A full, rich, deep personality on all sides is the sure and only condition of effective preaching.

Another truth, emphasised by more than one writer in this volume, is that of the organic unity of Scripture. Scripture is one, just as creation is one, and as human nature is one. The different inspired books are too often studied rather in their difference than their unity. We only obtain the right point of view when we regard Scripture as a complete whole advancing to its end by different stages. Dean Perowne says: "Our great duty is to remember that Scripture is a whole. It has a living

organic unity, and a varied growth and development, the recognition of which is essential if we would wield any portion of it as an instrument of power. Its books were written in different ages, compiled perhaps from ancient records, written by different men, under circumstances the most widely different, presenting to us every phase of human life and thought—the life of the city and the desert, the life of the shepherd and the trader, the life of the camp and the court; differing, moreover, in purpose and style—some historic, some didactic, some poetical, some prophetic, some epistolary. Nevertheless, they are one; one as the record, in a sense in which no other books are the record, of God's revelation of Himself to man, in and by the Church, in and by that Divine kingdom which He has set up upon earth; one, because one great central figure gives meaning and unity to all; one, because the Holy Spirit of God guided the minds and filled the hearts of those who wrote. . . . But if we have ever deeply felt and acknowledged this truth, it is impossible that we should rest satisfied with that mere text-handling which is so common in our pulpits."

Another point in which the writers agree is the undue preponderance of the hortatory over the doctrinal in the preaching of the day. All the aim is to be practical. A sermon is too often all application. But an application, to be effective, needs a substratum of doctrinal teaching. The inspired Epistles are our model in this respect. The doctrinal exposition always comes first, then the application. Intelligence should be appealed to as well as emotion. Canon Barry says: "I cannot help fearing that there is a tendency nowadays to rely too exclusively on the *παράκλησις*. The one praise of sermons is that they are hearty, stirring, earnest, affectionate. . . . Doctrine, as doctrine, it is thought, should be relegated to the essay or the lecture; it is enough if the sermon rouses the conscience and warms the heart. . . . Christianity, be it remembered, is a religion based on facts and animated by living principles. To those facts sermons must bear constant witness, as did St. Peter's first sermon on the Day of Pentecost. Those principles sermons must draw out and exhibit, as did St. Paul's sermon on Mars' Hill. In both these functions the element of teaching must lay the basis, on which the power of exhortation is to build up its superstructure." On the same point Dean Perowne says: "I am bound to say there is one element in our sermons which might be made much more prominent than it is, and that is the element of instruction. A friend of mine, a distinguished layman of the University of Cambridge, once said to me, 'There is one thing we miss in sermons, and that is instruction.' I am persuaded he is right. If we would take pains to teach our people out of the Scriptures, if we were really to strive to ascertain, and bring out, and set

forth in a clear and lively manner, the meaning of the Scriptures, we should never lack fruitful subjects, and never, I am persuaded, be without attentive hearers ; and, what is more, our instruction would not be forgotten ; it would live in men and build them up."

ATWELL'S PAULINE THEORY OF INSPIRATION.

The Pauline Theory of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

By W. E. Atwell, D.D., Rector of Clones. One Vol.
London : Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

No part of theological study is more interesting than to watch, not indeed "the Development of Doctrine" according to the Romish theory, but the development observable in the Church's understanding of the received doctrines of the faith. Of this, the history of doctrine in relation to the great subject of inspiration is a striking instance. Much has been said upon the inspiration of Scripture, but little upon the nature of that inspiration ; even so modern a work as that most useful series of lectures delivered by the present Bishop of Lincoln when Archdeacon of Westminster does not enter into the subject. This want has been felt by many, and as we are reminded, especially by the late Archdeacon Hare and the Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton.

But the want is now being supplied, and this thoughtful and original volume, on the Pauline theory of the inspiration of Scripture, is an indication of that. The work of Dr. Lee, first published in 1854, was a standard contribution to the subject. And now following the line of inquiry already started, we have this volume, which the author modestly styles an essay. We welcome it as a devout and ably-reasoned contribution to one of the most important questions in theology. Not indeed as being at all final or complete, but as insisting upon some aspects of the question which have been overlooked, and so bringing materials towards that fuller definition of the true nature of inspiration which is yet to crown the labours of Christian scholars.

The book is mainly a comment upon 1 Cor. ii. 12, 13, that passage being taken as the Pauline theory of inspiration. Dr. Atwell defines inspiration in general as "the supernatural actuating energy of the Spirit of God on the mind and heart of an individual, preparing him for the reception and for the manifestation of any of the gifts which He vouchsafes to bestow" (p. 85). Cordially as we welcome the book, there is much with which we are unable to agree. Our contention against the above definition as expanded in the work before us is twofold : it errs in the first place by too close an adherence to the merely etymological meaning of the word Theopneustia, the in-breathing of God ; for inspira-

tion, so far as we have any means of judging of it, connotes both the illumination of the mind and the message from God then given. And, secondly, the book errs in not providing against the application of inspiration to all Christians, for though Dr. Atwell dissents in terms from the lengths to which F. W. Robertson is led, yet consistently with his own definition he might as well bear Mr. Robertson company.

We are frequently told here that "inspiration is simply and solely a Divine subjective influence, and to objectify inspiration is to mistake its true nature, function, and office." On the contrary, we maintain that the Divine message to man is so essentially a part of inspiration that it must be taken into account in any definition of the nature of the gift. All our notions of inspiration are suggested by what we know of it as seen in that message, and any mystical definition which confines inspiration to an influence on the soul of the agent and requires the introduction of new terms when the gift finds expression, is unphilosophical in its nature and untrue to the facts of the case. By excluding from his definition of inspiration as such all reference to the work of the Holy Spirit in sending the Divine message in human words, the author deprives of its real meaning such a passage as 1 Cor. ii. v. 13: "Words . . . which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Fixing his attention on inspiration as a Divine illumination within the mind totally irrespective of a message, or of any form assumed in the delivery of it by the agent so prepared, Dr. Atwell leaves room for any kind of result, or any kind of utterance, which might be partly a truthful representation in words of the will of God, and partly new ideas more or less foreign to the subject to be communicated. If so, who shall tell us what is the Word of God?

We need in any theory of inspiration that it deals with what was said, and not merely what was thought, by the several writers: for in Scripture we have to deal with a written record of the thoughts and will of God concerning man, the being to whom that record is addressed.

Moreover, if inspiration be only "an actuating energy preparing the mind for the reception and manifestation of any gifts He may bestow," there may be an inspiration without anything being inspired. We think the consequences to which this undue fixing upon the subjective aspect of inspiration leads, even in the hands of the exponent of the theory, are seen on p. 108: "Thus these men of God were . . . constrained to deliver the heavenly knowledge conveyed to their minds with the sanctity and definite colouring of truth." If the words of Scripture had only "*a definite colouring of truth*," we fear the sanctity attaching to them would soon become of a very indefinite character. There is, we are told, "a Divine guidance to writing, but this is not inspiration." We

ask, What is it then? The reply is, "It is something following inspiration, and overleaping its boundary."

Indeed, so anxious is the writer of this book to view inspiration and any reception of its truths apart from man's physical constitution, that he says, p. 134, "The transcendental truths of God cannot gain access to the soul through the natural ear." The sufficient reply to this is, "Faith cometh by hearing." We are told in this volume that inspiration can be reduced to two classes: I. Primary and personal; II. Secondary or biblical. The result to which such a subordinate classification of God's Word written must lead, we think, is clear when we are told that, "Having ears to hear is another form of expressing the gift of inspiration" (p. 37), inspiration, be it remembered, of the first, or primary order.

While, however, we are compelled to dissent from some of the views of Dr. Atwell so far as they profess to afford a definite and complete theory, we hasten to repeat our conviction that this essay does insist on some aspects of the question which have been overlooked; as, for instance, p. 148: "I cannot agree with Archdeacon Lee when he says, 'The inspiration of the authors of the Bible was an energy altogether objective, and directed to supply the wants of the Church. The inspiration of the Christian is altogether subjective, directed to the moral improvement of the individual.'" Here, so far as the first part of the sentence quoted is concerned, the criticism is just; for we regard the inspiration of the authors of the Bible as an energy both subjective and objective: subjective in preparing the mind of the agent, objective in the message committed, and in the form which, consistent with the laws of that agent's mental constitution, the message should take as a Divine, and therefore authoritative, message to man.

HARPER'S METAPHYSICS OF THE SCHOOL.

The Metaphysics of the School. By Thomas Harper, S.J.
London: Macmillan and Co. 1879.

It is a gigantic scheme that Mr. Harper has taken in hand; nothing less than an exposition of the Scholastic philosophy, with a view to its restoration to public esteem. That he will succeed in the latter part of his design Mr. Harper can scarcely hope, and we do not fear. He might as well try to re-establish the Ptolemaic astronomy. The present volume, of nearly six hundred pages, is the first of four, and deals with three points in as many books—the Definition of Metaphysics, Being, Attributes of Being. The first book is divided into three chapters, the second into four, the third into four with the due number of subdivisions. The following volumes are to treat of the Principles of Being, the

Causes of Being, the Primary Determinations of Being, the Categories of Aristotle, Natural Theology.

In a long and lively introduction Mr. Harper defends the Scholastic system against objections which have been brought against it, and expounds the method which he intends to follow. He replies to the charge of a barbarous terminology by giving long lists of technicalities taken from works on chemistry and physiology. The retort is sufficient, if it was worth giving. The main objection is to the whole method and substance of Scholasticism, and this he would find it more difficult to repel. As there were as many different schools in Scholastic days as in modern philosophy, an expositor has to choose which one he will adopt as his guide. Mr. Harper chooses St. Thomas, to whom the Jesuit order is devoted. The form of treatment adopted is that of Suarez. No one questions the subtlety of the Scholastics, and of Thomas of Aquino in particular, but Mr. Harper is surely going too far when he extols him as the modern Aristotle. It is simply incredible that, if this were the case, all the world outside the Papal Church should never have discovered it.

With a view to relieve the dryness, which he admits is a characteristic of the Scholastic style, Mr. Harper makes free use of modern examples and applications. The following is one of these: "A fourth source of error is a *practical incredulity touching the responsibility of thought*. It stands to reason that evil may attach to thought, more especially to spoken or written thought, quite as much as to action. . . . But nowadays there does not seem to be the slightest sense of this responsibility. Each man speaks and writes as it seems good in his own eyes; and like Cain denies, in act at least, that he is his brother's keeper. Men treat as an axiom, which none but a fool or a bigot would think of questioning, that the propagation of opinions (no matter how false, immoral, or pernicious to society) ought never to be instituted as a statutable offence. Yet the evil is more widespread and persistent than in the case of criminal actions; and it is hard to understand why the murder of the soul should be a less offence than the murder of the body." Another source of error is *literary venality*. "Correspondents are commissioned to *write down* on one side, and *write up* on the other, before arrival at the scene of their labours, without personal knowledge of the state of things which it will be their task to depict. Inconvenient letters revealing the truth are suppressed, and an unpopular cause is shut out from all hope of self-vindication." Of course it is Mr. Harper who speaks here, not Aquinas. We hope that Aquinas never indulged in such onesided representations.

The work, which is a most laborious one, will, when completed, have a certain value as a work of reference, but even then we shall only have the opinions of one among a crowd of writers.

KALISCH'S PATH AND GOAL.

Path and Goal, a Discussion on the Elements of Civilisation and the Conditions of Happiness. By M. M. Kalisch, Ph.D., M.A. London: Longmans.

IN the form of discussions between imaginary disputants, the author of this volume passes under review the various theories of philosophy and religion now agitated in the world. The first chapter describes the combatants. The "Host," we presume, indicates the author himself, a Jewish philosopher in search of truth. His "Guests" comprise representatives of different phases of Christian faith, a Rabbi, Mohammedan, Parsee, Confucianist, Buddhist, Physicist, Pessimist. Whether the characters sketched are in any case taken from life, it is impossible to say. The author would scarcely have described living characters in such minute detail. The subjects discussed are such as the Dignity of Man, God, Soul, Immortality, Pantheism, Pessimism. Each disputant attacks or defends according to his relation to the subject in hand. Stoic and Cynic, Stoic and Christian, Epicurean and Darwinian, defend their respective views, quoting their best authorities, and using their best arguments. The difficulties inherent in such a form are fairly grappled with. That they are perfectly overcome cannot be said. But the author has not indicated his own leanings by the arguments put into the mouths of the different characters. So far, he has been impartial. His own opinions are stated openly. He has not attempted the more difficult task of making the speakers use different styles. One mind and one tongue evidently speak throughout. But with this exception, the naturalness and truthfulness of the different parts are preserved with great ability. When it is remembered that these descriptions of so many various theories and systems really represent the labour of one mind, it will be seen that the work is the outcome of no ordinary culture.

As to the substance of the book, we cannot speak so highly. It is interesting, of course. Whether it will prove as useful is matter of doubt. We fear the impression left on many minds will be the uncertainty of everything. If the various discussions represent the course which the author has himself traversed, it would be hard to say at what results he has arrived. The "Path" is plain enough; not so the "Goal." In the end, all the disputants retain their own opinions, while acknowledging that there is something in the opinions of the others. Lucretius seems a favourite poet. Such a result cannot be regarded as satisfactory. The notes afford ample evidence of wide reading, including quotations from the Talmud, Greek and Latin philosophers and

poets, Spinoza, Goethe, Schopenhauer, Hartmann, and many others. A complete translation of the book of Ecclesiastes forms part of the work, being taken as a sort of starting-point for the discussions.

GRANT'S BIBLE RECORD OF CREATION.

The Bible Record of Creation True for every Age. By P. W. Grant. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE only fault we have to find with this volume is its length. Few in these days can spare time for a considerable volume on the Scripture record of creation. Otherwise the work is unexceptionable, suggestive in matter, thoughtful and scholarly in style. The narrative in Genesis is expounded at length under three heads: first, Universal Creation; then, the Creation of Man; lastly, the Temptation and Fall. The purpose of the exposition is to show that the sacred text agrees, or may be made to agree, with the author's theory, which is set forth in other chapters. The principal point in which the present exposition differs from others is that the author does not regard the six days as necessarily indicating regular succession. Stress is laid upon the absence of the definite article in the indications of time in the first chapter. The author would render "one day"—"a second day," and so on. He regards the account as a very general description, in which the objects created are grouped together without reference to definite order of temporal succession. An order of a certain kind is asserted, but it is still more indefinite than previous theories have assumed. As another attempt to throw light on a difficult subject, the work is to be commended for its thoroughly reverent tone.

MISCELLANEOUS.

DAWSON'S FOSSIL MEN.

Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives. An Attempt to Illustrate the Character and Condition of the Prehistoric Men in Europe by those of the American Races. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S., Principal of McGill College and University, Montreal, Author of "The Story of the Earth and Man," &c. Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

It is 345 years since Jacques Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence and landed at the Indian town of Hochelaga. This he describes as "a round citie" (we quote Hakluyt's translation) "compassed about with timber, with three course of rampires, one within another, framed with pieces of timber very cunningly joyned together after their fashion." The inhabitants grew maize, pounded it with wooden pestles, and baked cakes with heated stones. They smoked fish and flesh "without any taste or savour of salt," and made wampum of shells. In fact they were living just as the "flintfolk" were living in a prehistoric British village; and in less than a century after Cartier, when the Sieur of Maisonneuve was founding Montroial, they and their city had disappeared as wholly as have the dwellers in Maiden Castle or the other Wiltshire and Somerset fortresses. Thenceforward till 1860 Hochelaga was lost to the eyes of men; it was then unearthed while excavations were being made in the west end of Montreal for house foundations, and the "finds" were, as Principal Dawson points out, exactly like those so common at home, and so universally attributed to ages long anterior to the dawn of history; indeed, "but for Cartier's narrative, the Montreal excavators might have supposed they were dealing with the relics of a people who perished thousands of years ago." The inference is that our chipped flints and primitive pottery and polished stone implements need not be pushed back into such remote ages. Even the so-called palæolithic flints of the Somme valley and elsewhere Dr. Dawson suggests may have been in use along with the polished or neolithic implements, the former being used as hoes in the summer farming of the lower levels, and left during the winter floods in the spots where they are now found by men whose homes, and

therefore their more artistic implements, were on the higher ground. He instances the flint hoes or picks similar to those of the St. Acheul gravel pits, which are found in alluvial deposits near the Ohio mounds. Most of the American archaeologists, who seem to make it a point of honour to dispute the vast time-claims of their European brethren, attribute these to "the highly civilised nations of the Mississippi valley who possessed copper implements." Such flints are found in caches, as if quantities were used at one time; and their being found by themselves, and not associated with polished implements, is no argument against their being contemporary. To think otherwise is, in our author's estimation, "an inveterate prejudice;" such tools would be kept by themselves, and never where they were not wanted, just as the stone gouges (probably used for drawing off the sugar maple sap) are found apart, unmixed with any chipped stones. Arrows and war-axes, on the other hand, are not found stored up, if we except the so-called palæolithic and transition weapons which Dr. Dawson believes to be half-finished instruments, roughly shaped at the quarry, and left to be finished at leisure when the flint should have got damp enough to be more workable.

On the whole, we are told, the weight of American evidence past and present is against any distinction between palæolithic and neolithic; and the European facts will, we are assured, if properly looked at, lead to the same conclusion.

Of course it is a question for the geologist: but Dr. Dawson is no tyro in geology. He does not underrate the evidence about the Kent's Hole deposits, beneath which implements have been found; he simply says, "to explain these by the continued operations of merely modern causes, without taking into account floods and other cataclysmic agents, is a stretch of uniformitarianism which the deposits themselves plainly contradict. Thus our calculations as to age rather serve to bring the age of the mammoth up toward us than to throw man back in geological time."

We are thus thrown back at once into catastrophic geology; and the wrought flints which cannot be accounted for by work having been carried on at different levels, are not relegated to an unmeasured antiquity because buried beneath successive layers of mud and stalagmite, for the causes now at work in nature acted in earlier times with far greater intensity.

There the matter rests; meanwhile Mr. Dawson's books (for they all deserve careful reading) ought to make us suspend our judgment and reconsider our facts, instead of taking to that scientific dogmatism which is more offensive than its theological namesake.

We see in Europe the stone age lasting on almost to yesterday—stone implements being in use till lately in Ireland and Scandinavia: nay, one form of stone implement, the flint and steel,

being by no means obsolete even yet. We see in America the civilisation of the stone age co-existing with the fullest modern culture. Why, then, should we demand such vast periods of time for the growing up of this modern culture, and why imagine that the old stone-age folk were one whit lower in the scale than the Red men whose implements so closely resemble theirs? The Red men, indeed, have gone or are going, without having exercised in a great part of North America any perceptible influence on the intruding race which has displaced them. Those who are left have degenerated—Dr. Dawson has a chapter on “the lost arts of savages;” the wonderful hard stone pipes are now no longer made east of the Rocky Mountains. Of the flint-folk we may believe that they were either Basques or Lapps or else Celts, *i.e.*, cousins-german of the Teutons. In the latter case they must have improved rapidly; and it is not impossible that the Red man might have improved had he been better handled. At any rate, there was as much difference between the Mexicans and the Hurons as between the *Æduan* or *Belgic Gauls* and the savage *Attacetti*.

Dr. Dawson (whose book would have been much improved by an index) has collected a great number of facts about “the physical characteristics of prehistoric men,” of which we will only say that it is a little rash to argue from the capacity of one or two skulls here and there. He pronounces the *CroMagnon* men to have been “gigantic and magnificent,” thus confirming the belief that “there were giants in those days.” “Judging from their great cranial capacity, and the small number of their skeletons found, we may suppose they represent rude outlying tribes belonging to races which elsewhere had attained to greater numbers and culture. These giants were superseded by a small-statured race with shorter heads, possibly after the catastrophes which destroyed the post-Pliocene continent that stretched westward through Ireland. But whether this bigness of brain indicates, “like the mound-builders preceding the Red Indians, that man’s earlier state was the best, that he had been a good and noble creature before he became a savage,” we cannot pretend to say. Dr. Dawson claims that this high organisation of the cave men “justifies the tradition of a golden and Edenic age, and mutely protests against the philosophy of progressive development as applied to man.” We do not see how, as a geologist, he reconciles man’s recent origin with his *CroMagnon* man having possibly visited “the great Atlantis, and the Valley of the Gihon where now is the Mediterranean, and that nameless river which flowed where now is the German Ocean.” But, then, he is a catastrophic geologist, and believes that Noah’s flood was the break up of this post-Pliocene world, and the bringing land and sea into their present shape. His explanation of the height above

the present water level of the Somme valley caves is ingenious: the land may have risen. It certainly has done so in Scandinavia, in Scotland, &c. "In the days of the cave men the lower valley may have been a sort of delta, with banks of gravel, to which they might resort for materials, or into which their rejected implements might be drifted." They would thus have lived when the land was slowly rising, after the great depression which let in the Irish Sea and German Ocean on what had been dry land.

His summing up, then, is that there is no ground for believing in any race more rude or less physically developed than the modern semi-civilised races. The modern savage is a degenerate creature; the most ancient man seems to have been a well-developed and cultured Turanian: and this "tells in favour both of the moderate antiquity and unity of the species." Further, Dr. Dawson thinks he can find in these old men "the primitive idea of God, the instinct of immortality, and even some premonitions of a Redeemer." Into this very important subject we cannot enter; but we strongly recommend (on the *audi alteram partem* principle) the students of Dr. Tyler and Sir J. Lubbock to see what use the American geologist makes of much the same facts as those with which they deal. The similarity between the carved reindeer horns of the Dordogne cavern, and the totems of Red Indian tribes is at any rate curious; while Dr. Dawson's engraving of the upright monument of a Chippewa chief closely resembles some of the "sculptured stones" of Scotland, and some of the French *roches percées*. That so-called "primitive" modes of interment lasted on in outlying places to quite modern times, is proved by the discovery, in previously unopened Cornish barrows, of very late Roman coins associated with chipped flints and rude pottery.*

LANG'S OXFORD.

Oxford: Brief Historical and Descriptive Notes. By Andrew Lang, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. With Etchings and Vignettes. By A. Brunet-Debaines, A. Toussaint, and R. Kent Thomas. Seeley and Co., 54, Fleet Street.

WHOEVER wishes to see really beautiful etchings should look at this choice volume. If he does not know Oxford, he will be seized with a strong desire to visit it; if he knows it already, he will confess that in illustrating it, the well-known artists who are associated with Mr. Lang have outdone themselves. Of the ten

* See W. Copeland Borlase's *Naenia Cornubia*.

large etchings, in very different styles, we will not attempt to pick out the best; they are all excellent, though in one the subject—a general view of Oxford—is not so suited as the rest to the etcher's art, and yet has given Mr. Toussaint the *motif* for a very sweet etching. The vignettes, too, are very good; and, though many characteristic bits of Oxford are necessarily omitted, several are brought before us which the hasty visitor is too likely to pass by, such as the muniment room in Merton—perhaps the oldest of college buildings—and some, such as the old houses in Castle Street, which many University men have never noticed.

Mr. Lang's "Notes," moreover, are not at all padding; they are far away the most interesting account of Oxford that we have ever come across. He does not confine himself to the University. Many people forget that the town, much more than Cambridge, has, and always had, an independent life. Centuries before Master Robert Pulleyn began to lecture on divinity in 1133—the first beginning (Mr. Lang thinks) of the Oxford schools—the central position of the place, on the borders of Mercia and Wessex, and its great strength, surrounded as it was by half-a-dozen deep natural moats, marked it out for greatness in war and trade. It was a very important town before the Conquest; and rose rapidly from the ruin in which Robert d'Oily had laid it, after that typical member of "our old nobility"—"who (says the chronicle) spared not rich nor poor to take their livelihood away and to lay up treasure for himself"—had built his castle. We recommend all who can to follow Mr. Lang's advice, and go to the top of the one remaining tower of d'Oily's castle, on the other side of the Jews' mount, and study the network of streams which make Oxford almost impregnable and account for its importance, not only in the Danish wars, but in those of Stephen, and by-and-by in Charles the First's time. Long after the University began, when it was right famous as an University, numbering (tradition says) its 30,000 students, *there were no colleges*. These came into existence much later (let those who kept the millenary of University College say what they please), and they were not places of learning, nor founded primarily as such, but as religious houses; and, in a pleasant way, Mr. Lang points out how often in the history of Oxford the college system has been unfavourable to learning. Walter de Merton, who visited Paris with Henry III., and no doubt compared notes with Robert de Sorbonne, was the founder of the collegiate system. Why, in the bitter struggles between "Gown" and "Town," the former at last got the upper hand, Mr. Lang shows very clearly. The University had the legal knowledge, and that the kings liked to have on their side. When, therefore, as the result of the great town and gown row in Edward the Third's time, the whole University, worsted in the conflict, decamped and sojourned for years at Stamford, the king,

in reinstating them, gave them a charter "containing many liberties which he had taken from the town."

Soon began the age of colleges; and, in Mr. Lang's words, "learning dwindled as they increased under the clerical and reactionary rule of the house of Lancaster." Nor did the Renaissance do for Oxford what it did for Italy and Germany. Mr. Lang on this point is worth quoting: "The University reflected the intensely practical character of the people. In contemplating the events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, we are reminded of the *futility of certain modern aspirations*. No amount of University Commissions, nor of well-meant reforms, will change the nature of Englishmen. It is impossible, by distributions of University prizes and professorships, to attract into the career of letters that proportion of industry and ingenuity which, in Germany, for example, is devoted to the scholastic life. Politics, trade, law, sport, religion, will claim their own in England just as they did at the revival of letters. Then the genius of our race turned not to letters, but to dynastic and constitutional squabbles; to questions about the soul and its future; about property and its distribution." We may remind Mr. Lang that, valuable as intellectual culture is, it failed to make either Italy or Germany a nation, while these more practical strifes and questions helped to weld England together.

There were, however, gleams of "culture" in Chaucer's time, and again when Henry VIII. in his young days was encouraging study, and Wolsey and Bishop Fox were founding Christchurch and Corpus, and establishing Greek and Latin professorships, while at Cambridge they had to hire an Italian to write public speeches at twentypence each!

Then came the dark days of Henry's Commissioners, who, finding little to plunder at Oxford, broke up the libraries, scattering many books literally to the winds. Worse still were Edward the Sixth's visitors. If they found a book with red letters on the title, they burnt it as popish; if it had angles, or other mathematical figures inside, they burnt it as magical and devilish. Two noble libraries were sold for 40s. for waste paper; a load of MSS. was carted away from Merton. But for Herks, a Dutchman, very few books would have been saved. Meanwhile, Oxford was almost empty; the schools were used by laundresses; the college plate and jewels were stolen.

So on, from age to age, Oxford is a place of politics, of religious controversies; now Jacobite, now Tractarian; but not of learning in the sense in which a small, almost unendowed German University has not seldom been; nor yet of science, as several Italian Universities were when medicine began to be scientifically studied. In art, again, can it be said that, despite the Taylor Museum, Oxford has done what she ought, while the Arundel

marbles are huddled away almost unknown just where Prideaux left them when he had published his "*Marmora Oxoniensia*"? Yes. Prideaux's *Marmora*, poor as it is, was a work far worthier of the University press than many which it issues now. Mr. Lang is quite right in lamenting that "the University press of to-day has become a trading concern, a shop for twopenny manuals and penny primers. It is scarcely proper that the University should at once organise examinations and sell the manuals which contain the answers to the likeliest questions." He is equally justified in what he says about the craze for destruction which is improving old Oxford off the earth, and filling its site with absurd and inconvenient architectural nondescripts.

Of High Tory Oxford, where they zealously drank to the king over the water, but left Scots and north countrymen to fight for him, of the Oxford of Gibbon and Johnson, and of that of Shelley and Landor, Mr. Lang tells much that will be new to most of us. Fancy Gilbert White (by-and-by of Selborne), when Proctor, "driving to Blenheim with Nan, which cost him 15s. 6d."! Landor was "a mad Jacobin; yet he was so far from relishing the doctrine of human equality that he speaks of 'servitors and other raff of that description.'"

We do not know how far our readers will agree with Mr. Lang that the father of the romantic movement in England and France (which in Oxford took the Tractarian form) was Walter Scott. In England, as usual, the æsthetic admiration of the past was promptly transmuted into religion. Tractarianism, then, by-the-by, was very different from that ecclesiastical millinery which we miscall ritualism. The Tractarians were thinkers, though "what had a meaning then and for them, is to us, some forty years later, as meaningless as the inscriptions of Easter Island."

Oxford, then, is less a home of learning than a microcosm of English intellectual life. Conservative as it is, it has always welcomed new doctrines. Whatever England will be thinking of a few months later, Oxford is sure to be thinking of to-day, and (such is the English character) the mode of thought is sure to be of a religious cast. As in the days of the New Learning, Oxford men nowadays "care less about philosophy and grammar than about their souls and their dinners." And yet, along with this inevitable tendency to give everything a religious turn, there is the no less inevitable doubting spirit which comes of the historical system. As in Rabelais's Island of the Macraiones, so in Oxford young men are led through dead creeds and philosophies, and shown that the noblest truths of past times were but half truths; no wonder if on the threshold of their own lives they meet doubts which they must either subdue or evade.

Mr. Lang has no proposals for amendment, though he evidently thinks Oxford might do more for the intellectual culture of the

nation without losing that peace and beauty and leisure which its peculiar arrangements secure to a favoured few. We do not want a bustling, jostling Oxford, but we do want to see more earnestness and thoroughness in its studies, and more expansiveness in its system, and less sordidness, less worship of rank and wealth among those who ought to be raised above such little trifles.

One thing is not sufficiently noticed,—that Oxford exclusiveness has not lessened under the new system. Scholarships and such like are now, as a rule, the reward of superior wealth in the parent, which enables him to secure timely and efficient training for his son; and lads so trained are likely to be far more insolent to those whom they deem “cads” than the poorer men, to whom, a generation ago, the accident of being born in such a county, or trained at such a school, secured a “scholarship.”

STUART'S NILE GLEANINGS.

Nile Gleanings concerning the Ethnology, History, and Art of Ancient Egypt as revealed by Paintings and Bas-reliefs, with Descriptions of Nubia and the Great Rock Temples to the Second Cataract. By Villiers Stuart, of Dromana. Fifty-eight Plates. Murray.

MR. VILLIERS STUART paints Ancient Egypt with a much firmer touch than that of most modern travellers, because, understanding hieroglyphics, he has certainty, where they have only hearsay. Moreover, his copies of wall-paintings, statues, &c., deserve to rank with the very best in Mariette Bey's books, and the older French works. Many of them are coloured, and most are not from photographs, but from the author's drawings. The advantage of this is seen in the colossal figures of Rameses at Abou-Seimbal. Here the difficulty always has been owing to the position to get anything like the real features of the colossus. “One's first impression is that the faces” (the effigy is fourfold) “are full and fleshy,” as they are generally represented; “this is owing to the great breadth of the head. A careful examination from the side, when the lights and shadows bring out the true conformation, shows the face to be really thin, as one would expect in the case of so restless a spirit.” Photography gives the general outline well enough, and is invaluable for hieroglyphics and other detail; but for sculptured faces it is as uncertain a process as it is for the living face. The face was the Egyptian artist's *chef d'œuvre*. In these armies of soldiers, of slaves, of priests, and priestesses, there are no two faces alike; all are full of individual expression, even where the figures are filled in in careless haste.

Mr. Stuart thinks that the heads only were done by the best artists, the rest being left to any one who could handle a brush; in this way only could such vast surfaces have been covered against time, "because the king's command was urgent." Egyptian art saw many vicissitudes. The earliest known specimens belong to the third dynasty; the mural figures of this date are executed in a coarse mosaic: there is a great advance in the two succeeding dynasties; then in the sixth came wars and troubles, and the sculptures are coarse, with monstrously large eyes. From the sixth to the eleventh dynasty is a blank. The art flourishes again till the invasion of the shepherd kings. The eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties are the golden age of Egyptian art, and thence to the end of the Roman Empire is a slow unbroken decay. There is, however, this difficulty,—if in the third dynasty art had not advanced beyond the coarse mosaics which adorn the walls of Nofre-Ma's tomb, how is it that such marvellous statues as those of Prince Ra Hotef and his wife, now set up under a glass case in the Boulaq Museum, can have been then produced? To this Mr. Villiers gives no answer. He merely says these two statues are the oldest in the world, and were found at Maidoon, not far from the archaic tombs which are figured for the first time in his book; and then he goes on to remark what a high state of art is evidenced by the rock-crystal eyes, and how singularly European are the features of both prince and princess. On this European type in all the older statues, the more scientific type not appearing before the eleventh dynasty, he founds the theory that either Europe was colonised from Egypt, or else that both Europeans and Egyptians sprang from the same Asiatic country. He notes the likeness between Etruscan and Cypriote art and Egyptian, and the fact that Greek traditions point to Egypt as the home of the race. He tries to strengthen his position in a way which will certainly not convince a comparative philologist, by picking out a few Egyptian words and showing their likeness to Greek, German, or English words. *Ra* is Egyptian for sun, and *eunou* for waves; but we do not prove oneness of origin by remarking that the Latin *radius* and *undæ* are somewhat similar in sound. More plausible is his view that these people, whoever they were, entered Egypt by way of Abyssinia. The dog-faced ape, giraffe, &c., are hieroglyphic signs, and these creatures are not found in Egypt. Again, whenever they represent the Abyssinians, they represent them as identical in dress and complexion with themselves. They rapidly spread northward; the name of Sene-freou, of the third dynasty (the first king about whom there is anything authentic), is inscribed on the rocks of Sinai, just as is that of Pepi, of the sixth, or Thothmes, of the eighteenth, or Rameses II. and III., of the nineteenth. This constant repetition is a notable feature of Egyptian history. Mr. Stuart well compares it with

the course of the Nile: "After following it up for hundreds of miles, you still find the same villages, the same palm trees, the same mountain ranges in monotonous uniformity; so it is with the triumphs of peace and war in the stream of Egyptian history."

In another way Egyptian history resembles the Nile. As that river flows on alone through the desert, unaided by a single tributary, so for long centuries did Egyptian history flow on without a contemporary, developing on its way the arts of civilised life. In the Nile valley the Egyptians were unmolested for ages—shut up as in a vast fortress, with all the necessities of life, the finest climate in the world, and no need to defend themselves either against man or the elements. They had more leisure for the arts than any other people. Hieroglyphics lose their romance of mystery on nearer acquaintance. There are some 3,000 signs (an alphabet of 3,000 letters!); many signs are used for the same sound, the same sign often for several totally different sounds, the sense being clumsily eked out by so-called determinatives. Some signs are obvious enough,—a sheep means *ba*, a goose *sse*, an ass *haw*; so of another class a beetle spells *kafr* (strangely like our chafer), a waved line *en*, because *en* means a wave (our N is an abbreviation of the wave, just as our M is very like the Egyptian, and our S is simply the goose's neck). The greatest puzzle comes from the way of cutting. In this, the scribes were guided purely by symmetry. In the royal cartouches, the name often begins in the middle, continues at the bottom, and ends at the top, without anything to indicate the proper order. It is just as if the letters of Victoria were scattered haphazard on a shield, and the reader was left to make out what they spelt. We cannot help thinking that this, and the use of determinatives (three to one name sometimes), and the long array of signs used for a particle (five to represent the future tense) introduce some uncertainty into the interpretation. Mr. Villiers says no: "From long practice one acquires an instinct in reading;" but to us it seems a good deal like guessing acrostics. One great help is that after the sign often comes its interpretation, a little figure of the object meant, which (like the determinatives) was not pronounced in reading. The signs of abstract ideas were of course the hardest to interpret. Love, Mr. Stuart says, is signified by the hoe, the earliest instrument of tillage; the idea being that you only cultivate what you prize, as in Latin *cultus* came to mean worship.

Quite as striking as his pictures are Mr. Stuart's descriptions. The great pyramid is rather worn threadbare; but his picture of it, with its eighty-five million tons of cut stone, enough to build a wall six feet high and a yard thick right across from Liverpool to Newfoundland, gives it new freshness. After describing corridor after corridor, he takes us down, down to a chamber built

of enormous blocks of granite beautifully jointed together, "more like the work of gnomes than of men, for how could men move and fit into place these ponderous masses in such a confined space?" Fancy the needless work (for the rock-hewn chamber was complete without its granite lining), the stifling air, the years of toil to move the blocks one by one along the narrow corridor!

Mr. Stuart takes us through the whole series of Egyptian art from Sene-freou to Cleopatra, of whose perfect Greek face with short upper lip he gives a drawing from Dendera. At Thebes, he discovered a tomb much defaced by the priests, for it was that of a foreign king who brought in an alien mode of worship.

He also tells us about Egypt as it is. He saw the dancing dervishes, and the sheik of the pilgrims riding over the heads of the devotees. We are glad his view of things is more hopeful than that of most visitors. The Khedive meant well and eased many burdens. Twenty years ago, Mr. Stuart saw far more grievous oppression, not then to pay creditors, but to fill the pockets of Turkish officials. Like everyone else, he thinks the only chance for the country is a system of European administrators like that whereby we manage India. To prove that things are better, he reminds us that 20,000 men perished in making the Mahmoudieh canal; yet his description of the Khedive's sugar factory, worked by forced unpaid labour, is bad enough. If things are better now, what must they have been a generation ago?

Mr. Stuart is properly severe on the dragomans, those lazy, ignorant fellows who are the indispensable curse of Egyptian travel; and also on the ravages of tourists—the great Lepsius, who cut a slab bodily out of one of the chief inscriptions to carry off to Berlin, being as great an offender as any.

His notices of the Egyptian religion are only incidental. In the earlier monuments there is very little religion at all; at Thebes, the various purgatories and the judgment of souls are fully pictured. That the body should be preserved whole and unbroken seems to have been an essential to after happiness. Hence the irony of events which delivered the mummy of Rameses to be torn in fragments by Cambyzes. On one tomb Mr. Stuart read: "Thou, O my God, art sure. I am saved. As Thy limbs are sound so are my limbs sound," and nothing of the body (a queen's) remained but one poor foot.

GILES'S STRANGE TALES FROM A CHINESE STUDIO.

Strange Tales from a Chinese Studio. Translated and Annotated by Herbert A. Giles, of H.M.'s Consular Service. Two Vols. Thos. De La Rue, Bunhill Row.

CHINESE is notoriously a hard language; its demands on the memory are exorbitant. For ten years Mr. Giles was working at

the multitudinous characters and strange grammar, at the same time that he was familiarising himself as much as possible with Chinese sympathies and habits of thought. Residence in nine stations—Pekin, Canton, and Taiwan Fu in Formosa being among them—and overland journeys of many hundred miles, give him, he thinks, special qualifications for translating a difficult Chinese book, and for presenting it to the public in a form likely to arouse “a somewhat deeper interest than is usually taken in the affairs of China.” We can only say that, if this result is not attained, the fault will be with the public, for two more interesting and admirably got-up volumes we have seldom met with. We know very little about the Chinese as they are; the Laureate dismisses them with a sneer about “a cycle of Cathay;” Mr. Giles complains that even Tylor’s *Primitive Culture* gives barely a dozen short passages to the rites and ceremonies of nearly a third of the human race; much of what we do hear is “palmed off on us by inefficient and disingenuous workers.” Mr. Giles claims to be “a qualified observer, who can have no possible motive for deviating ever so slightly from what experience has taught him to regard as truth.”

The student whose work he gives us is Sung-ling, of the house of Pü, who laid down his pen just two centuries ago, “after completing a task which was soon to raise him to a foremost rank in the Chinese world of letters.” But, despite the lapse of time, these novelettes and supernatural tales, forming a complete repository of folklore, “contain much of what the Chinese do actually believe and practise in their religious and social life.” The fox is still, as in Japan, an uncanny creature, much as the hare was among the old Britons in Cæsar’s day, and still is in Wales and the west of Ireland. The Taoist priest is still valued as an exorcist, whose wooden sword, duly salved with potent herbs, will cut the foul fiend in two. The worthless son, who brings sorrow on his father, is still looked on as the incarnation of some one whom, in a previous state, that father had wronged. The bodies of those cut off in their prime are still liable to be appropriated by devils, who, thus housed, are able to work their murderous will unsuspected. In fact, the modern Chinese is intensely superstitious as well as thoroughly matter-of-fact. The two feelings are not at all incompatible; in the same way the superstitious Celt is far more matter-of-fact than the sceptical German. In these 164 stories we learn a vast deal about the ways of thought and manner of life of the Chinese. They are a people who improve on acquaintance. Filial love, reverence for age, courtesy which is more than superficial, a strong sense of justice, and a most laudable amount of forbearance—these are some of their traits. Then, wealth is certainly less considered than in Europe and America. Education, which is almost sure to bring official

rank, is what men are chiefly valued for. A nation cannot be wholly debased which believes firmly in a state of rewards and punishments; a purgatory, the king of which has everybody on his books, and knows exactly what their life has been, and therefore what they deserve at his hands. There is no trace in these stories of anything like the blasphemy of "indulgences." Souls have to work out their own penalties, often by passing into lower forms of existence, good behaviour in which will shorten their term, and pass them on to another stage. The following remark by Mr. Giles puts the Chinese character in a very pleasing light: "Fondness for children is specially a trait of Chinese character; and a single baby would do far more to ensure the safety of a foreign traveller in China than all the usual paraphernalia of pocket pistols and revolvers." He might have added of Armstrong guns and war steamers, for surely the way in which we have been used to deal with the Chinese has not been the most fitted to conciliate. To say nothing of the Christianity of such a course, its unwisdom must be evident to all who are not blinded by those ideas which lead us to change an amiable and intelligent nation into stubborn foes.

We hope Mr. Giles will have many readers; for no one can read him without learning a great deal about the manners, customs, and social life of a people whom long experience has taught him to love.

Of the stories themselves, some are merely tales of adventure, as, for instance, the shipwreck of a Cochin Chinese on the island of the cave-men, possibly Hainan. The cooked food in the shipwrecked man's wallet was highly appreciated by the cave-men, and, as a saucepan was saved from the wreck, he was able to cook for them. At first they kept him a close prisoner, rolling, cyclops-fashion, a big stone to their cave's mouth when they went off for the day. By-and-by they relented, and chose a wife for him. At first he was dreadfully afraid of her; but she conciliated him by giving him all the tit-bits at dinner. At last he and one of his sons escaped, and the latter entering the army, soon rose to high rank owing to his exceeding strength. After he had been some years a general, he went over and brought away his mother and brother and sister. The brother also became a general; but the sister found it hard to get a husband, so masculine was her appearance. At last a sergeant married her, and found the value of a wife who not only would shoot birds at a hundred paces without ever missing, but who also in battle stood clad in armour by her husband's side.

More characteristic are the numerous tales about fox-wives and spirit-wives. One spirit located in a house behaves so well to the owner's mother that the old lady actually arranges a match between her and her son; and the spirit becomes so carnalised

by being long "subject to the influence of surrounding life," that she ceases to be afraid of spells, and by-and-by becomes the mother of two fine sons. Altogether, Chinese spirits are by no means wholly immaterial. Devils can be maimed or cut in two; and foxes (who may be met buying wine in the crowded shops as the fairies used to be met at Welsh fairs) may easily be killed by poisoned drink. Fairy-feasts have the same unsubstantial nature which marks them in the West; two friends gorgeously entertained at such a banquet woke in the morning to find themselves, the one on a dung-hill, the other with his head in a drain.

There are Chinese mediums as well as Chinese fairies; and that remarkable power of being in two places at once, which the Roman Church calls bilocation, and which it attributes to some saints, is well known in China. This, however, may be Buddhist, as is (of course) the elaborate system of ten hells, each with its own king and its own officers, two of whom are thus quaintly described: "One has on a black official hat and embroidered clothes, and holds a pencil as well as a sharp sword. He glares with large round eyes and laughs a horrid laugh. His name is *Shortlife*. The other has a dirty blood-smeared face, a counting-board in his hand, and a string of paper money round his neck. He utters long sighs; his name is, *They have their reward*."

Of secret societies the Chinese have plenty; but they are not all political; sometimes the young ladies of a certain district band themselves together under the name of a certain flower to eschew matrimony.

With the modern theory of the conservation of energy the Chinese popular belief exactly tallies; the whole system of successive births depends on the idea that the sum of life is constant. Mother Meng's cups of medicated tea perform the office of the water of Lethe, and one spirit who manages to shirk drinking, retains (like the Indur of our boyhood) his human intelligence through all his transmigrations.

But we must refer our readers to a book of which a brief review can give no adequate idea. If, as the ethnologists now tell us, the earliest dwellers in Western Europe were yellow men, congeners of the Celestials, there is very probably a strain of Chinese blood in some of us; but, apart from this, Sung-ling's studio is marked with that touch of nature which makes the whole world kin. "How can there be a country where fathers are not valued?" asks a son in one of these stories. The question gives the key to the whole Chinese system of polity; it is based on family life.

We wish Mr. Giles had said something about the progress and prospects of Christianity among this interesting people.

SMITH'S GIPSY LIFE.

Gipsy Life: being an Account of our Gipsies and their Children, with Suggestions for their Improvement. By George Smith, of Coalville. Houghton and Co., Paternoster Row.

MR. G. SMITH, who has done such a good work for the children in our brickfields and for the floating population of our canals, is anxious to interest Parliament in behalf of his new clients the gipsies. "Missionary zeal, without moral force of law and the schoolmaster, will accomplish but little for the gipsies at our doors; and this may be said with special emphasis as regards the improvement of gipsy children." Therefore he dedicates his book "to the peers and members of the High Court of Parliament," in the hope of having gipsy children brought under the Education Act and their vans under the sanitary inspector.

In his closing chapter, Mr. Smith gives a draft of the rules, educational and sanitary, which he suggests. All these are thoroughly practical, except the proposal that "lords of manors should grant gipsies a 99 years' lease at a nominal rent of half an acre of waste, so as to encourage the gathering on marshes and commons of a number of gipsies, of which localisation the outcome would be useful and profitable." Others, besides lords of manors; would doubt, we fancy, the usefulness of such localisation.

Of the duty, however, of educating and sanitating there can be no doubt; and "if (as Mr. Smith says) we had had 5,000 gipsy men tilling our waste lands for the last century, they could have brought and kept under cultivation some 20,000 acres." As it is, legislation has simply done the gipsies harm. The Hawkers and Pedlars Act allows no one under sixteen to carry a license; therefore the young gipsies, left out of sight in the Education Acts, are condemned to utter idleness with its natural consequences. In Spain, Germany, France, our author tells us, nearly all the gipsies can read and write; with us the proportion is less than one in five. In Norway they can be legally kept in prison till they can read and write. Even in Austria it seems they have settled into colonies; while in Germany their state is widely different from what it was little more than a century ago, when Grellmann wrote that "during hunting the hunters had no scruple whatever in killing a gipsy woman and her

sucking child, just as they would any wild beast that came in their way."

One great change has, however, passed over the race in England. The wild attire, gold and silver buttons, heavy jewelled rings, are gone; and the modern English gipsy is, what he looks, a very poor as well as a very disreputable creature. The romance of gipsy life, when Riley Bosvil, whose life Mr. Smith sketches, was the type of a large class, is gone, and with it the blood horses, and saddles silver-studded with sun and moon and seven stars, and silk and velvet dresses and beaver hats and so forth; and at present the home life, so to speak, of the gipsies can vie in squalor with that of the most hopeless of the dangerous classes. We cannot, however, think that they are worse off than many hundreds of pure Celtic or Teutonic blood save in the one fact that they were overlooked in the Education Act. If they are in rags and tatters, so are hundreds of others; if their vans are sometimes fever dens and nests of small-pox, so are too often the lodgings of the unmigratory poor. Mr. Smith was horrified at a dish of snails, and wholly discredited the assertion of his gipsy hostess that the proffered hedgehog was better than rabbit. Gipsies, he adds, eat things that die of themselves; sometimes the East-end and Drury-Lane poor do the same unwittingly after buying at a cheap butcher's. Nor do we think that gipsy morality is so much worse than those of other "Arabs" because its imperfections lie more on the surface. An old gipsy woman who was sick was honest enough to say: "If the dear Lord spares me, I shall tell lies again. I could not get on without it, how could I? I could not sell my things without lies." It would be well if every medium and Spiritualist lecturer were as honest. "Fortune-telling (says Mr. Smith) is a soul-crushing and deadly crying evil;" but surely not more of an evil, and not so dangerous in its effects as Spiritualism. Mr. Smith found that gipsies very often live together unmarried, and that overcrowding in their sleeping dens leads to the usual results. But then their condition can be matched among those who have no trace of gipsy blood.

We do not wish, in saying this, to dispute one of Mr. Smith's conclusions; we would only point out that what he says of gipsies is true of a considerably larger class, and that therefore the ground of action is not exceptional wretchedness or immorality, but that forgetfulness on the part of the law which cannot be tolerated in the case of even a single subject. While we are right, we think, in theory, Mr. Smith is probably right in practice. The readiest way of removing an injustice is often to get up a cry; you might go on for a long time urging that the children of some 18,000 or 20,000 Britons (many more if we include the non-gipsy vagrants) were left out of the provisions of the

Education Act ; but you will be likely to rouse many, and thereby to put pressure on Parliament, if you show that the state in which these children are growing up is a danger to society. There are other dangers, and we shall perhaps always have our dangerous classes ; but still this danger should at once be averted as far as putting the attendance officer in motion can do it. Readers of Mr. Smith are pretty sure to be roused. After his fashion, he goes into the matter at once impetuously and thoroughly. Merely glancing at the origin of the gipsies (undoubtedly Hindoo ; famines in old times were wholesale emigration-agents), saying little about their language (in England mostly slang), he descants on the iniquitous treatment the wanderers received from their first appearance in Europe. Our own statutes are disgraceful enough. They were, by a statute of Henry VIII., to be tried without jury when accused of any crime, and Elizabeth's law deprived them of benefit of clergy, condemning as felons all who stayed more than a month in the realm. Sir M. Hale says thirteen were hanged under this statute a few years before the Restoration. This statute was not repealed till 51 George III. Persecution however, had its too general effect ; it degraded but did not exterminate them. There was nothing within them to be refined by fire, and the fire was not severe enough to be consuming. Their local persistence is remarkable. Mr. Smith quotes Mr. Harrison, of Yetholm, to the effect that the king of the gipsies there still bears the name of Faa, so well known from the old ballad ; their beauty seems greater in England than elsewhere. This is due, thinks our author, to the Saxon cross. At any rate, Annie, the well-known Notting-Hill model, whom he compares to Clytie in the British Museum, had an Oxfordshire peasant for her mother, though her father was a pure-blood gipsy. The only case of gipsy children coming under school-training is curious. "In 1811, one Thomas Howard, a Fetter-Lane shopkeeper and preacher among the Calvinists, opened a Sunday school in Acre Lane near Clapham : and, during the winter, a gipsy family took up its residence opposite. The daughter, a girl of thirteen, applied for admission, but on account of the obloquy affixed to that description of persons she was repeatedly refused. She, however, persevered in her importunity, till she got admission for herself and two of her brothers." That the three behaved well, made progress, and showed sorrow when they had leave to go on tramp in spring seemed so wonderful that the minister of Stockwell Chapel adds his testimony to that effect to Howard's.

Mr. Smith's faith in education is great, for he has a very poor opinion of the gipsy character. "The true Indian types and traits are caste-feeling, devilish jealousy and diabolical revenge, and notwithstanding the mixture of race among our gipsies, the

diabolical Indian elements are easily recognisable in their wigs. In any country an English emigrant enters an improvement takes place; in any country where an Indian emigrant of the gipsy tribe enters, the tendency is the reverse; downward to the ground and to the dogs they go."

But Government has grappled with the Thugs, and therefore Mr. Smith has faith, if only Parliament can be got to listen. We heartily wish such a zealous and valuable worker all success; and we do not think his strong language is likely to hinder this success; while had he written less sensationally his work would no doubt have been less generally attractive.

Roughly classed though the gipsies may be among the dangerous classes, we cannot hold that their influx has polluted us in the sense in which Juvenal said that the Orontes was polluting the Tiber. Christianity ought to make, and doubtless does make, such contamination harder.

One little contradiction strikes us in Mr. Smith's meritorious book—he says no gipsy has attained to excellence in anything; elsewhere he opines that Bunyan had gipsy blood in his veins.

MASSON'S LIFE OF JOHN MILTON. VOL. VI.

The Life of John Milton: narrated in Connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time.
By David Masson, M.A., LL.D. Vol. VI., 1660—1674.
London: Macmillan and Co.

MR. MASSON'S great work, the labour of many years, is at last finished. Germany can scarcely show anything more extensive. Six bulky volumes, containing upwards of 4,000 pages, surely include everything that is ever likely to be known of our great poet. When the index, now in course of preparation, is published, the work will be as good a specimen of elaborate completeness as English literature possesses. Bulky as the work is, it is the opposite of dull. There are so many previously unpublished details, the style is so animated, that interest never flags. The concluding volume deals with the last fourteen years of the poet's life, the years synchronising with a portion of the Restoration period. As it was in this period that the great works were written upon which Milton's fame rests, we have far more of the personal and literary, and less of the historical element, a circumstance upon which we congratulate ourselves. There is not much in the history of the Restoration upon which we can dwell with pleasure and pride. We gladly turn from court immoralities, Bartholomew Sundays, hangings and quarterings of regicides,

Dutch fleets victorious on the Thames, to the story of the genesis of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*.

At the same time the present volume supplies more than one interesting illustration of the close connection between the historical and biographical in Milton's life, and therefore of the wisdom of the plan adopted by Mr. Masson. In the very full details given of the proceedings in Parliament in reference to the regicides, the author makes it probable that the condemnation of Milton's writings, which led to a brief imprisonment, was a delicate manœuvre, on the part of friends, to save him from a worse fate. Many suffered the extreme penalties of the law who had done less to bring them under the charge of treason. It gives one a start to think that any indiscretion or accident might have turned the scale the other way, and England might never have had the glory of *Paradise Lost*. So, again, the Great Plague led Milton to remove, toward the end of 1665, to the pleasant village of Chalfont St. Giles, in Buckinghamshire, about four miles from Beaconsfield. Mr. Masson accordingly gives us a picturesque description of the village and its surroundings. Milton's cottage, it seems, still exists. "It is the last house in the village on the left side of the end pointing towards Beaconsfield, and is about half-way up the slope at that end. It is a small irregular cottage, of brick and wooden beams, divided now into two inhabitable tenements, each with its own door. . . . To all appearance the small lozenges of glass set in lead which one now sees are those which were there when Milton sat in the rooms; and some of the bolts about the lattices and doors also remain unchanged. Milton's favourite seat within doors at first must have been at one of those latticed casements; where, knowing only at second-hand of the somewhat limited view thence of which others might complain, he could feel the summer air blowing in upon him from the garden, with the hum of bees and the odour of honeysuckles. Where there is merely a door now to the garden, with an old grape-vine trained over that part of the front wall, there was once a porch, forming a kind of independent projecting room, in which Milton may have also liked to sit. Nightingales are plentiful about Chalfont, and he may have heard them from this porch in the evenings." Milton's relations to the Great Fire are thus pictured: "The Fire was no collateral casualty for Milton, but an actual and tremendous experience. For three days or so he and his household were among the huddled myriads on the edge of that roaring, crackling conflagration, which was reducing two-thirds of the entire city to ashes, drawing down the vast bulk of St. Paul's, and a hundred other towers and steeples from their familiar solidity on the old sky-line, hurling burning timbers and scorching smoke whichever way the wind blew, turning the sun overhead by day into a blood-coloured ball, and lighting up the

sky at night over four counties with a lurid glare like that from a thousand furnaces. Helpless on the edge of this horror and commotion, only the sounds of which could come into his own sensation, while the sights had to be reported to him, the blind man sat for three days and three nights." His own house in Bread Street, in which he was born, and "which was all the real estate he had then left," was destroyed, and with it so much of his income. Three of his London homes—Aldersgate Street, the Barbican, Jewin Street, were spared. "As nearly as I can measure, the fire had come within a quarter of a mile of Milton's house in Artillery Walk, leaving so much of a belt of unburnt streets and lanes, Chiswell Street and Grub Street among them, to separate him from the part of the ruins that lay between Cripplegate and Moorgate." The church of St. Giles, Cripplegate, his parish church in his Barbican days, and where he lies buried, and the church in Jewin Street, his parish church afterwards, were just spared.

Not the least interesting portions of the present volume are the particulars of Milton's personal appearance, tastes, and habits. His day was carefully measured out, closing with a pipe and glass of water. In his latter years he suffered grievously from confirmed gout. He lived much alone, although not inaccessible to visitors and company, when, his daughter assures us, he was "the life of the conversation, and that on account of a flow of subject and an unaffected cheerfulness and civility." His fondness for music is well known. "Hearing a lady sing finely, he said, 'Now will I swear this lady is handsome.' His ears were now eyes to him." "If talking of Greek literature, he would go back again and again on the greatness of Homer, whom he could repeat almost by heart, and, while always full of admiration for Æschylus and Sophocles, he would resent any depreciation of Euripides in comparison. Among the Latin poets, while enthroning Virgil, he had still always a word of liking for Ovid." Spenser was a greater favourite with him than Shakespeare. Of recent poets he admired Cowley most. Hobbes was not a favourite. In his latter years Milton belonged to no Church, and did not attend public worship. "Although," he says, "it is the duty of all believers to join themselves, if possible, to a church duly constituted, yet such as cannot do this conveniently, or with full satisfaction of conscience, are not to be considered as excluded from the blessing bestowed by God on the churches."

The volume contains ample discussions of Milton's Works, among others, of the curious *Treatise on Christian Doctrine* in English and Latin, which was only discovered in 1823, and published for the first time in 1825. In this treatise Milton professes to draw every doctrine from Scripture alone, which is assumed to be a Divine revelation. It is characteristic of the difference

between those days and the present, that no proof is offered as to the Divine authority of Scripture. This is everywhere supposed to be a settled point. The treatise contains curious speculations. The doctrine respecting Christ is that of high Arianism. To the Holy Spirit a lower position is assigned. Matter is derived from the substance of Deity, a view which places Milton alongside Gnostics or Pantheists; but unlike Pantheists he held strongly to the doctrine of the freedom of will. Milton also denied the distinction between body and soul, and the immateriality of the soul. Yet it would be wrong to describe him as a materialist. He says, "Man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual, not compound or separable, not, according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body, but so that the whole man is soul, and the soul man—that is to say, a body or substance, individual, animated, sensitive, and rational." Apart from these grave errors, many of Milton's definitions are admirably expressed. Thus, "The humiliation of Christ is that state in which, under the character of God-man, He voluntarily submitted Himself to the Divine justice, as well in life as in death, for the purpose of undergoing all things requisite for our redemption." "Redemption is that act whereby Christ, being sent in the fulness of time, redeemed all believers at the price of His own blood, by His voluntary act, conformably to the eternal counsel and grace of God the Father." The definitions of justification and regeneration are equally good, save that he makes justification follow regeneration.

GOSSE'S NEW POEMS.

New Poems. By Edmund W. Gosse. London: Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

IF, as Mr. Coventry Patmore says, "men should judge poets by their best,"—and the critical canon is, no doubt, sound,—then there are pieces in this volume which assure to Mr. Gosse a very high place among contemporary poets.

Of such pieces we will say more presently. Meanwhile it may be well to seek to penetrate somewhat into the mysteries of his art,—to discover, not precisely "the very pulse of the machine,"—for, with all deference to Wordsworth, a poet is no more a "machine" than is a woman,—but the source of his inspiration, the living spring of water which his muse haunts most habitually.

And first, it must be quite clear that no prophetic zeal, no apostolic earnestness of ethical purpose, animates his song. There are, indeed, in this volume a few passages to which it would be difficult to find a parallel in what he has written before, passages

indicating a growing recognition of the moral aspect of life as a fitting theme for poetry. Thus he cries, in the "Autumn of the World,"

"Here in the autumn months of time,
Before the great new year can break,
Some little way our feet should climb,
Some little mark our words should make
For liberty and manhood's sake!"

and again, in a poem which he entitles, with some implied blame, perhaps, on his earlier modes of thought, "The Palinode,"

"The least of us is not too weak
To leave the world with something done."

But though we note such passages with pleasure, yet they are not sufficiently numerous, nor especially is there about them such a ring of stern conviction, as to entitle us at all to conclude that the writer has any moral mission.

Neither again do we feel in his verse the wild pulse of human passion. The hot blood of humanity does not course through it. There are here no *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. Nor, on the other hand, is he oppressed by the many problems that haunt the surrounding darkness in which our little lives are the short luminous track.

No, Mr. Gosse is not the poet of high purpose, or passion, or philosophy. His muse, to whom we have already referred, dwells in a beautiful dell of culture, somewhat apart from the world of life and thought, and yet not so remote but that its sounds are pleasantly audible among the nearer whisperings of leaves and winds. Here, as we have already seen, she catches now and again an echo of humanity's march-movement of progress and endeavour; here the mystery of evil—for even here bird, beast and insect are cruel and at war—is but a theme for the musing of a summer day; * here the emotions of life come rather as memory or hope than as present realities.

Are we struck once or twice, amid so much that is beautiful, with a feeling that this muse has moments when she is a little modern and "æsthetic"? There is an engraving which one may see in the parlour of country inns. It represents the last moments of a fox-hunter. He is *in extremis*. The doctor feels his flickering pulse. His wife weeps at the foot of the bed. His friends of the hunt fill the room. One of them holds up the fox's brush, and the rest greet the trophy with a measured cheer, to which the parson, a wine-glass in hand, beats time. This work of art dates, we imagine, from some forty-five or fifty years ago, and was once used, unless our memory much deceives us, to point one of Mr. Ruskin's terrible denunciations of the nineteenth century as being an age when men were comforted in their last

* "Verdleigh Coppice."

moments by the sight of a fox's tail ! We seem to have travelled far, very far, from Mr. Gosse and his fair muse and her beautiful sequestered dell, and yet—shall we confess it ?—we were reminded of this engraving by the exclamation :

" O sweet for dying hands to hold
The earliest jonquil pale ! "

Fifty years ago, a fox's tail—to-day, a pale jonquil—how æsthetic we have grown.

But this is of course merely jest, and Mr. Gosse, who is a humourist himself, and might, were he so minded, excel in humorous verse, will, we hope, forgive us. We only meant to indicate in which direction there is danger for the poetry of cultured feeling.

That poetry, however, has its own legitimate and beautiful sphere within which Mr. Gosse has executed finished and admirable work. Let us enjoy the pleasure of praising, from which the critic is so often, alas, debarred. As we have already said, there are pieces in this volume of great beauty—harmonious in versification, and very complete. We might quote largely in corroboration—quote from the "Proem," "The Whitethroat," "The Return of the Swallows," "The Pipe-player," "The Burden of Delight," "Aleyone." But perhaps the fairest course to author and reader will be to give, not several extracts, but one almost whole poem which is at once typical, and to our thinking, of rare perfectness. It is entitled *Desiderium*.

Sit there for ever, dear, and lean
In marble as in fleeting flesh,
Above the tall grey reeds that screen
The river when the breeze is fresh ;
For ever let the morning light
Stream down that forehead broad and white,
And round that cheek for my delight.

Already that flushed moment grows
So dark, so distant ; through the ranks
Of scented reed the river glows
Still murmuring to its willowy banks ;
But we can never hope to share
Again that rapture fond and rare,
Unless you grow immortal there.

Hold, Time, a little while thy glass,
And, youth, fold up those peacock wings !
More rapture fills the years that pass
Than any hope the future brings ;
Some for to-morrow rashly pray,
And some desire to hold to-day,
But I am sick for yesterday.

Since yesterday the hills were blue
That shall be grey for evermore,
And the fair sunset was shot through
With colour never seen before ;

Tyrannic love smiled yesterday,
And lost the terrors of his sway,
But is a god again to-day.

Ah! who will give us back the past?

Ah! woe that youth should love to be
Like this swift Thames that flows so fast,
And is so fain to find the sea;
That leaves this maze of shadow and sleep,
These creeks down which blown blossoms creep,
For breakers of the homeless deep.

Then sit for ever, dear, in stone,

As when you turned with half a smile,

And I will haunt this islet lone,

And with a dream my tears beguile;

And in my reverie forget

That stars and suns were made to set,

That loves grow old or eyes are wet!

We have said that this poem is typical. It illustrates what we have hinted at, rather than shown, as being the source of Mr. Gosse's inspiration. The thought is analogous to that in Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn*. In both poems life with its emotions, its joys and sorrows, is felt to be a thing of a moment, flashing, flying, gone. To Keats the figures on the Urn, in their eternal motionless beauty, seemed happier than the race of men. To Mr. Gosse there comes a yearning to make one brief perfect moment imperishable and changeless, even though two loving hearts be turned to stone in the process. Is there not in the thought what may be called a certain *art-alooftness* from life? And it is in this *alooftness* that Mr. Gosse dwells. It is here that he finds his inspiration. And may he often bring us from thence such poems as this "Desiderium."

HUXLEY'S INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ZOOLOGY.

The Crayfish: an Introduction to the Study of Zoology. By T. H. Huxley, F.R.S. [One of the volumes of the International Scientific Series.] London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1880.

To say that this book is written in bright, terse, forcible English; that it is characterised by an admirable exactitude, completeness, and symmetry in the statement of the facts and principles which it seeks to elucidate; and that it opens various lines of discussion and thought, ranging much beyond its immediate topic, is only to say that it is a scientific treatise from the pen of Mr. Huxley. The anatomy and physiology of the crayfish are worked out in the volume with that combined knowledge of detail and mastery of generalisation for which the author is so deservedly famous. Indeed, nothing of moment at present ascertained by science

respecting the crayfish, from the etymology of its name to the determination of the geographical habitats and geological history of the creature and its kindred, is wanting to the reader. The work, however, is not intended to be simply a popular monograph on the crayfish. It is really a zoological sermon, with the crayfish for a text. To use Mr. Huxley's own words, the object of the book is "to show how the careful study of one of the commonest and most insignificant of animals leads us, step by step, from everyday knowledge to the widest generalisations and the most difficult problems of zoology, and, indeed, of biological science in general. . . . For, whoever will follow its pages, crayfish in hand, and will try to verify for himself the statements it contains, will find himself brought face to face with all the great zoological questions which excite so lively an interest at the present day; he will understand the method by which alone we can hope to attain to satisfactory answers of these questions; and, finally, he will appreciate the justice of Diderot's remark, 'Il faut être profond dans l'art ou dans la science pour en bien posséder les éléments.'" The volume answers precisely to this description of its purpose. And we can promise the young zoologist, who, scalpel and microscope in hand, will work his way through its contents, with all their wonderfully lucid definitions of phenomena, and their accurate and vivid illustrations by diagram and picture, that he will lay it down again, not only knowing nearly all that is known of the crayfish, but having his eyes open to those worlds on worlds of reality and scientific speculation which crayfishes, duly apprehended, imply and symbolise.

Our student must be careful, however, not to accept without discrimination the philosophical dogmas of even so great a master as Mr. Huxley. It may be true, for example, as Mr. Huxley puts it, that we cannot tell "whether a crayfish has a mind" (*i.e.*, a reasoning faculty) "or not;" but it is not true, as the writer's language elsewhere suggests, that a crayfish, any more than a man, is the mere sum total of a number of organic elements and functions. If our senses and reason teach us anything, they assure us that, alike in the crayfish and the man, there is a somewhat—call it mind, or what you please—hyper-phenomenal and hyper-functional, apart from which neither the one creature nor the other can go through that marvellous process of experience, or perform that manifold series of acts, which together constitute its life. A crayfish gives every sign of possessing feeling, perception, and will; and if this be so, it is something more than a piece of machinery worked from without by the changing conditions of its being. I may not know what that something is; but I do know that it exists: and there is the widest possible difference between knowing this, and knowing nothing at all of the matter.

In like manner, again, when Mr. Huxley speaks of "the philosophical worthlessness of the theory of creation," he uses language which, to say the least, requires softening. As a working principle in science, the doctrine of creation has, indeed, been overstrained. Empiricism has repeatedly used it as its *deus ex machina*. But the philosophy which takes it for granted that the development of nature excludes the possibility of creation, is itself empirical. Indeed it is not only empirical, but demonstrably false; for the same kind of evidence which compels me to believe that, within certain limits, there is a natural evolution of terrestrial life, assures me that, as matter of fact, from time to time the course of the evolution has been supernaturally varied. And when it is considered that "the theory of creation" is the only philosophical bridge by which we can span the gulf dividing the First Great Cause from the works of His hands, Mr. Huxley does not speak advisedly in his summary dismissal of it as worthless.

One feature of Mr. Huxley's volume has strongly and painfully impressed us. So far as we remember, there is not throughout it a solitary tribute to the glory of Him, of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things in heaven and earth. We desire no prating about religion either in scientific books or anywhere else; but, on the other hand, it ought not to be possible for a great master of science in Christian England, and in this nineteenth century of grace, to send forth a volume exhibiting the marvels of structure and endowment presented by one of the lowlier types of terrestrial life without some word of reverent admiration and homage for the Perfection which has made them all. This non-recognition of the Creator in the contemporary scientific literature of Christendom is a portent and a wrong. Whether Mr. Huxley knows it or not, the dead silence preserved by a leader of opinion like himself, where the great Theistic and Christian verities are concerned, is very commonly interpreted as meaning a disbelief of religion, or even an hostility to it, such as, we are satisfied, he would entirely disclaim.

FOREIGN CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Foreign Classics for English Readers. Edited by Mrs. Oliphant. "Goethe," by A. Hayward, Q.C. "Petrarch," by Henry Reeve, C.B. William Blackwood. 1878.

ON the whole, these two volumes fully maintain the reputation of Mrs. Oliphant's series. If Goethe's life is less satisfactory than the rest, the fault is not Mr. Hayward's; it is that so many of us have read Lewes and Carlyle on the same subject. On the former

writer (whose too early death the whole literary world deploras) Mr. Hayward is now and then, we think, too hard. He should have kept always in mind that the public, for whom Mrs. Oliphant is catering, want rather to know the truth about Goethe than to hear what a distinguished Englishman has, it may be erroneously, said about him. Goethe's autobiography, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, is of course the best authority for the details of his life. "He tells us that he inherited his fine bodily frame and earnest conduct of life from his father; his joyous temperament and love of story-telling from his mother; his devotion to the fair sex from a great-grandfather; his love of finery and gewgaws from a great-grandmother. He nowhere mentions that the great-grandfather in question was a tailor, and the great-grandmother the daughter of one. He had no less than three tailors in his ancestry; and his great-great-grandfather, Hans Christian Goethe, beyond whom the utmost diligence of biographers has failed to carry his pedigree, was a farrier of Artern, in Thuringia." So writes Mr. Hayward; and German society, with its stiffness and caste, was long in forgetting this humble pedigree. It was "social incompatibility" that mainly prevented his marrying "Lili," though she was only a banker's daughter.

We are glad Mr. Hayward does not say too much of Goethe's too numerous loves. His coolness through them all is provoking; when he found he was getting entangled, he used to break away, and console himself by writing a play or a poem. Mr. Hayward analyses all his chief works, and points out (what few of us suspect) the way in which several of his scenes (notably one in *Egmont*) were plagiarised by Sir Walter Scott. He is right, we think, in saying that "except *Faust*, there is no other work of Goethe which is first rate of its kind." *Wilhelm Meister*, with its subtle criticisms on *Hamlet*, &c., would be so were the plot a little more carefully worked out. Goethe truly remarks of it, "I myself can scarcely be said to have the key. Critics find a central point which indeed is hard to find." Goethe's great feature was his manysidedness; from "the sorrows of Werther" to his "doctrine of colour" he ran up the whole gamut of literature, making each note respond harmoniously to his touch. We specially recommend Mr. Hayward's chapter on "Goethe as a man of science" to those who have not been wont to think of him under this aspect. Goethe's weakness was his want of public spirit; unlike the other great Germans of his time, he never took up with enthusiasm the crusade against France. If Mr. Hayward at times speaks disparagingly, he winds up with unmeasured eulogy: "We do not hesitate to declare him the most splendid specimen of cultivated intellect ever manifested to the world."

The fame of Petrarch depends on his sonnets to Laura; but few of those who talk about these know how completely artificial

(often absolutely frigid) they are. Whether the poet ever spoke to the lady of his verse is doubtful: "the passage of her shadow, the dropping of her glove, the scent of a flower, the rustle of a laurel bush, are all that Petrarch's imagination fed on; and it may be doubted whether he was ever honoured with a nearer approach to her personal favour or even acquaintance." Despite the scepticism, however, of some biographers, Laura de Noves was a real woman, the dates of whose birth, marriage, and death are well ascertained. More important in his own eyes than his sonnets were his Latin prose writings: "the rhythm of Ciceronian prose was the enchantment of his life." He also wrote a Latin poem on *Africa*, the hero of which was Scipio Africanus (Silius Italicus's poem on the same subject had not then been discovered). Of this Byron has translated one passage—the death of Mago; but Landor, no mean judge of Latin poetry, affirms that no one could ever read more than five hundred lines of it. But, though he wrote much in Latin, he is justly honoured as the father of Italian verse, to whom the language owes much of the shape into which it grew. He was, above all things, a man of letters, and "the first who, after the irruption of the barbarians, raised the culture of letters to supreme honour." How he managed, in spite of his poverty (he was the son of a banished notary), always to be in the best society has always been a problem. He had great social qualities, and was not at all hampered with Dante's dislike to eat another's bread or mount another's staircase. His position, however, was probably due to the patronage of the Colonnas, with one of whom he had formed an intimate friendship at the University of Bologna. Certain it is that Petrarch was not only "the apostle of scholarship, the inaugurator of the humanistic impulse of the fifteenth century" (Symonds's *Renaissance in Italy*), but also a successful diplomatist. So great was his consideration at the Colonna court that the Cardinal used to say, when any disputed question arose, "the word of Petrarch is enough." Petrarch's letters, describing his travels in Germany and Holland, his ascent of Mont Ventoux, &c., are, to our view, the most interesting of his writings. He had plenty of self-confidence; in his first work, a Latin poem to his dead mother, he says the two will be immortal together; and in his *Epistle to Posterity*, written when he was sixty-seven years old, he formed the same estimate of himself. We still account him a great man, though he and Dante have changed places in the world's view since the days when they were partly contemporaries.

ANCIENT CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Ancient Classics for English Readers. "Lucretius," by W. H. Mallock. William Blackwood. 1878.

PROFESSOR TYNDALL has given a new interest to the Lucretian

philosophy; and it is, perhaps, specially interesting that the author of the *New Republic*, the recent convert to Rome, who has questioned whether life is worth living, and has told us that, unless we accept the Papal dogmas, we may at once make up our minds that we can neither be virtuous nor logical, should have taken in hand the atomic theory of the atheist poet.

Mr. Mallock's rendering of difficult passages has been questioned; but, on the whole, his summary of Lucretius's system is clear and satisfactory, while his chapter on "Lucretius and Modern Thought" is very suggestive. He notices how different was the Roman (by the way, the only really Roman) poet from us in his position, not only with regard to philosophy, but to the worth of life and religion as connected with life. "It was easy enough to prove that the crude and puerile theology of that day was a useless factor in any theory of the conduct or existence of life." Such gods as he knew could be of no use in manufacturing the world; "but the God whom modern science encounters, and whose aid it is endeavouring to dispense with, is a very different God from these. . . . He is a God to whom space and time are nothing. . . . Such a phrase as 'the universe is a thought of God,' shows us how different a thing is the theism we are now calling in question from that which was called in question in the ancient world. . . . The ideal of life has been growing; and yet the actual facts of life have remained much the same. If the moral life is the real end of man, how is it so few can attain to it? If justice is the true thing, how is it that injustice seems everywhere to have the mastery?" Mr. Mallock goes on to contrast the complacent atheism of Lucretius with the passionate bitterness of Omar Khayyám, when his materialism forces him to disbelieve. To Lucretius, disbelief was pure gain; to the Persian poet, it raises as many problems as it solves. To us moderns, the thought of a mindless uniformity everywhere, that takes no heed of man, and knows nothing of him, cannot fail to be inexpressibly miserable. Even Lucretius, however, looks on life as a gloomy thing; and we know how easily he gave it up. Is our view of things, asks Mr. Mallock, clearer? "No," he replies; "we have grown wiser, only by having come to recognise what a very short way our greatest wisdom carries us. Modern science leaves us in greater perplexity than did ancient science. Faith offers to cut the knot. Science can only satisfy us by assuring us that, so far as our moral life goes, there is no knot to cut." We quite agree with Mr. Mallock that the light of nature is very feeble; that, "let us do our best and live by what light we have," is poor and sadly insufficient advice. But still we do not think that anything is gained by depreciating science; as matter of fact its votaries do not assure us there is no knot to cut, but only that they cannot find any; and to drive us to Rome because there is no soul's

resting-place in philosophy is worthy only of the zeal of a new convert. Differing as we do with him, we can yet find very much to praise in Mr. Mallock's volume. His "*Dawn of Physical Science*" is a careful summary: his analysis of Lucretius's poem is full and complete.

CARPENTER'S LIFE AND WORK OF MARY CARPENTER.

Life and Work of Mary Carpenter. By J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co.

THE life of Mary Carpenter is the record of a great and good work, achieved by a sensitive, tender-hearted woman, in the face of inner conflicts and outward disappointment and discouragement such as would have daunted any but the bravest spirit. She was the eldest child of a Unitarian minister in Bristol, whose influence over the whole course of her life was peculiarly marked, although he died before her life-work had fairly begun. From him she received her intellectual and spiritual education, and a mental bias that determined both her career and her religious belief. Had it not been for him, she declared she should have devoted herself to science, and not philanthropy. And we cannot but feel that it was his theological training only that kept her a Unitarian. She had a very tender conscience, and analysed her feelings and motives with a frankness and fidelity that brought their most secret imperfections to light. So searching was her self-scrutiny that at times she was overwhelmed by a sense of remorse and failure. In search of a remedy, she was again and again "tempted to throw herself on the doctrine of the Atonement in despair." It is inconceivable that any but a thoroughly prejudiced student of the Bible could say as she did of this, its central truth: "I find so many texts strongly against it, that I do not think I can ever embrace such a doctrine while I keep to the Scriptures." And thus her life was shadowed by "the anguish of personal unfaithfulness," for which no consolation was found.

Her attention was early directed to the needs of children belonging to the "perishing and dangerous classes," and for more than thirty years she laboured for them in public and private. Beginning with the little outcasts in her own neighbourhood, she gathered many of them into a Ragged School, and when their histories demonstrated the need of Reformatories, she established one at the old Wesleyan premises at Kingswood. John Wesley's study was fitted up for her occupation during her frequent visits to the place. When it was found necessary to separate the girls from the boys, the Red Lodge School was founded for them, and of this she retained the undivided responsibility and control till her death. Other institutions were added according to the

demand, and in the mean time, by treatises, conferences, and letters to statesmen, she laboured to awaken general interest in the children of the lowest classes, and to promote Parliamentary legislation on their behalf, always insisting on the principle that convicted children should not be sent to prison. In her book, entitled *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, she collected a formidable body of evidence, such as had never been brought together before, to prove the increase of crime among children, their ignorance, the want of suitable provision for their training, and the total failure of the gaols to reform them when criminals. An examination of the institutions already established to meet their needs showed, further, the superiority of those that aimed at reform instead of punishment, and the need of their being supported by public aid and authority. But public opinion was not ripe on the subject; and her book was but the beginning of her work. What she accomplished in the end is thus told by one of her fellow workers:

"She mainly originated the movement for dealing effectually with the criminal and vagrant classes. It was she who, in conjunction with the late Recorder of Birmingham, Mr. M. Davenport Hill, organised the conferences which laid down the lines of future action on that subject. There were others who had much to do with obtaining reformatory legislation, and establishing the first reformatory schools. But what was most remarkable in Mary Carpenter was the prevision which she showed on the whole subject. She maintained from the first, and kept steadily in view, the sound opinion that there were three classes to be dealt with—a class of habitual young criminals, who could be treated only by long sentences in reformatory schools; a class of lesser criminals and vagrants for whom certified industrial schools were required; and beneath these, and feeding their ranks by a constant influx, a third class of truant and neglected children infesting the streets of every considerable town, who formed a hotbed in which juvenile crime and vagrancy were hatched. For these last she recommended from the first a separate class of schools, not so much of a penal as of an educational character, and she always maintained that the war against crime and vagrancy would never be successful until the whole of this programme had been carried out. Reformatory schools were established; certified industrial schools followed, . . . but it was not till after many years of effort that she succeeded in obtaining a Parliamentary enactment for the provision of those Day Feeding Industrial Schools which she believed to afford the ultimate solution of the whole question."

Her work for young criminals naturally led her to consider the general principles of the treatment of adult offenders, and her thoughts and inquiries in this direction resulted in a work on

"Our Convicts," describing their condition and treatment, and pointing out the different ways in which Government and the people might labour together "for the regeneration of the misguided and neglected in our country, and for the restoration to society of 'our convicts.'"

The long-continued strain of these labours made itself felt at last, and as a remedy Miss Carpenter sought, not rest, but change of work. At sixty years of age she sailed for India to see for herself what was being done to raise the condition of native women, and how the work might be extended. In addition to this, her first object, she gave much attention during her four visits to the country to prison discipline, reformatory and industrial schools, and the hours of labour and the employment of women and children in factories. She did a great deal to awaken general interest in the objects of her mission, but the success of her schools does not appear to have been as great as the powerful influence and authority by which she was supported gave reason to expect. She freely acknowledged the value of the educational work done by the missionaries, but asserted that the Christianity offered by them to the people of India is what they will never accept.

Her hold upon her earliest interests was never suffered to relax, as one after another was added to them. Each in its turn received as minute attention as if it were the chief object of her care. She lived for the "cause of humanity," and in pleading for it entirely forgot herself, and mastered the shrinking timidity that would have limited her usefulness. Of her interview with the Queen, to which her Indian work led her, she said afterwards, "People have asked me if I did not feel nervous. I was not in the least so. I was not going for myself, but for the women of India."

But notwithstanding the social reforms which she achieved, we feel throughout that she is working at disadvantage, owing to her maimed, imperfect creed. She was weighted, and at times all but overwhelmed by a burden which she need never have carried, and the Gospel message she delivered to others was robbed of its chief power. Nevertheless there is much to learn of her. She dwelt continually on the loveliness of Christ's character. His life was her inspiration and constant study, and, following in His footsteps, she "went about doing good." It would be well if all who give due honour to Christ in their creed did as much in their lives to glorify Him as Mary Carpenter.

Her story is one that needs no embellishments, and Mr. Carpenter has told it simply and well. Unlike so many other biographers, he intrudes neither his praises nor his comments, but leaves her work to speak for itself.

BROWNE'S WATER SUPPLY.

Water Supply. By J. H. Balfour Browne, Barrister-at-Law, Registrar to the Railway Commissioners, &c., &c. Macmillan:

THE water supply of our great towns is one of the most important questions of the day; and, in regard to London, it must soon be settled. Of the economical side of the question, the just as distinguished from the ridiculously unjust claims of the companies—we have lately seen a good deal. Mr. Browne approaches the subject not as a ratepayer, nor as a shareholder, but as a collector of scientific opinions on important practical points.

Whether spring or river water is best for general supply, how far sewage contaminates running streams, what amount per head is the proper town supply—such are some of the questions on which, in a legal manner, he collects the various opinions, showing his own views in his summing up, but not deciding dogmatically where experts differ.

And they do differ wonderfully. It would be unfair to say that whatever opinion you want supported you are sure to find an inquirer or medical man to back it up; but, looking at the evidence in the Wakefield Water Company's case, where four or five doctors and professors declared the Wath Main Colliery water to be "excellent, admirably suited for a town supply," while as many more denounced it as "bad—not a drinking but a mineral water," we really feel as if scientific evidence was of very little value. Still more startling is the difference of opinion elicited in the evidence on the Cheltenham Bill. Mr. Hawkesley, a very great authority, thought that the Cheltenham folks could not be hurt by drinking the diluted sewage of Worcester, the company's intake being at Tewkesbury, sixteen miles below the city. Indeed, he went so far as to say that "sewage cannot by any possibility continue to be sewage *even a couple of miles*. It is utterly impossible. It is all burnt up by the oxygen in the water and utterly destroyed." Yet Mr. Hawkesley ought to have known that outbreaks of disease have been undoubtedly traced to London water, especially during the cholera visitations of 1849 and 1854; and cholera travelled some twenty miles down the Don, from Sheffield to Doncaster; "the Doncaster people," as Dr. Frankland expresses it, "drank the sewage of the Sheffield people, and they got the cholera." The fact is we must distinguish between sewage and sewage: ordinary sewage is not deadly in its effects; in London, though the companies have at last been obliged to have their intake above Teddington instead of within tidal influence, we drink with little injury the diluted sewage of 800,000 people; but if fever or cholera excreta are thrown into the water there is

no limit to the distance for which they will retain their mischievous vitality. Hence the immense care that should be taken to bury all such discharges and prevent them from getting into any running stream. The Caterham case is a very curious illustration of this. Here a new well was sunk about eighteen months ago, and an adit driven from the old to the new at a depth of 455 feet. One of the workmen had enteric fever and suffered from constant diarrhoea; and, in spite of the precautions which he seems honestly to have taken, some of his excreta got into the water; the result being an epidemic in the district supplied from the works, the number of cases being 352, with 21 deaths.

Still more curious is the case of the Swiss village of Lausen. Here a good deal of the water from the neighbouring Furlenthal percolates underground and supplies the spring of Lausen. This was well known; for when the Furlenthal was irrigated the Lausen spring was always most abundant. No harm, however, had come of it; the roots of the Stockhalder mountain, under which the water trickled, acted as a huge filter, and the Lauseners drank with impunity. In June, 1872, a Furlenthaler had typhoid fever; and six weeks later the fever broke out at Lausen, attacking 139 people. The moral is that, though ordinary sewage is comparatively harmless (though surely not to the extent that Mr. Hawkesley asserts), fever and other excreta are almost indestructible; and those who throw them into streams are passing on disease to some one lower down.

Yet more dangerous is sewage gas, which, nevertheless, we are content in London to live in the midst of. Our splendid and elaborate system of drains and pipes must continue worse than useless (because it lulls us into false security) so long as Dr. Cayley can say that "in two-thirds of the cisterns of London houses, the waste pipe from the supply cistern goes directly into the soil pipe, so that the drinking water is habitually contaminated with sewer gas." The result is not so much absolute disease as that low type of health and tendency to "catch cold," &c., of which so many of us complain. Fancy the overflow pipe from a drawing room balcony going directly into the main sewer; so that when on these close evenings we sit outside for fresh air we are inhaling diluted poison!

On all these deeply important subjects, Mr. Browne collects facts as the basis of future (and it ought to be speedy) action. Of course he discusses Thirlmere and Loch Katrine, and the proper amount of water which each inhabitant of a town should receive. This of course is far greater in a town where any large quantity of water is used in manufactures; and such a town will naturally strive to get a supply of soft water, for hard, though the balance of evidence is in favour of it as a drinking water, is of course almost useless in many trades.

The sewer smells during this long drought, even in the best parts of London, prove that we are not yet all right in our sewage arrangements; while the contrast between our streets and those of some continental towns where water is always flowing fresh and fresh, shows that the companies who have made us pay so dear have done very little for their money. When we think of the abundant supply which kept old Rome healthy, we may well feel a little ashamed of modern civilisation, or rather of modern monopoly.

KERNER'S FLOWERS AND THEIR UNBIDDEN GUESTS.

Flowers and their Unbidden Guests. By Dr. A. Kerner, Professor of Botany in the University of Innsbruck. With a Prefatory Letter by Chas. Darwin, M.A., F.R.S. The Translation Revised and Edited by W. Ogle, M.D., M.A., sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

THERE is no doubt that the shapes of many flowers are just such as to keep out some kinds of insects and to admit others. Are these shapes instances of gradual adaptation, or of the original fitting of means to ends? Which gains most from Dr. Kerner's researches, the theory of creation or that of development? Dr. Ogle, in his preface, speaks of the stems of *Lychnis viscaria*, now viscous only in rings round all the higher nodes, as perhaps once sticky all over, while in future ages the viscosity may become limited still further to the top of the stem. But this is pure hypothesis; all we are concerned with is the fact that Dr. Kerner's observations may be just as readily used to support the argument from final causes as to teach "the preservation of advantageous varieties." Premising this, we can join with Mr. Darwin and Dr. Ogle in gratitude to the painstaking German, who "has interpreted the meaning of a vast number of floral structures, which, before he wrote, were passed over as purposeless." Granting the generalisation, first enunciated by Mr. Darwin, in his book on orchids, that "nature abhors perpetual self-fertilisation," it is clear that fertilising by insects is an important work. Hence, we are told, the bright colours, and the sweet scents, and the store of nectar sure to attract to the bottom of the flower visitors who, brushing against the pollen, carry some of it off and deposit it on the stigmas of the next flowers on which they alight. But many insects are fond of nectar whose visits would be valueless for purposes of fertilisation. Ants, for instance, and other such small, smooth-bodied creatures might glide into a nectary and rifle its contents without ever touching one of the pollen-bearing anthers. Such visitors must, therefore, as far as may be, be kept out.

Contrivances to effect this are seen in many flowers. Every child has noticed the bumps on the lower lip of the snapdragon, and of several kinds of toad-flax. These, combined with a strong spring in the lower lip itself, keep the entrance to the flower completely closed, that it is only by forcible pushing and shoving that an insect can get in. Such an insect must be strong, and therefore probably of a size to rub against the walls of the flower-tube, and carry off a quantity of pollen. Dr. Kerner shows that in several kinds of *Nigella* "the nectariferous cavities, formed in the petals, are closed by moveable lids. . . . I have seen ants striving in vain to make their way into the cavity. Our common honey-bees, on the other hand, can raise the lid with perfect ease. But then they are of such a size that, in visiting the flowers, and making their way to the closed nectaries, they must inevitably rub against the stigmas that lie just above, and in due succession against the anthers."

The habits of night-flowering plants, watched by Dr. Kerner with marvellous patience, show a like adaptation of means to ends. The nectar is the attraction which draws the fertilising insects. But by the time day has come, the first set of anthers (he is speaking of various *Silenes* which have two sets) has discharged its pollen, and hangs drooping from relaxed filaments; while the second set has not yet emerged. There is, therefore, no pollen to be rubbed off, and no fecundation of the stigma can go on. Insects, therefore, are unwelcome; they would eat up the nectar to no purpose. Hence the petals, during the day, are rolled round the stigma, their under-sides, of a dull inconspicuous colour, alone showing; and while, next night, when the second set of anthers is ready to appear, they unroll and display their attractions.

Sometimes, where there is otherwise only imperfect protection, this tasteful colouring matter in the perianth seems to keep off attacks. Thus the editor mentions that he gathered in Switzerland a hundred stems of the blue *Aconitum napellus*, and found not a single flower perforated; while every open flower on a hundred white flower-stems had a hole in its side. This accounts for the far greater abundance of the blue variety.

The butterwort and certain *primulas* protect their flowers against unsuitable insects by a rosette of viscid root-leaves spread out on the ground. The *bromelias* have the leaves of their rosette full of rain and dew. We all know how the *Drosera* (sun-dew) catches insects in its collapsing hair-fringed leaves. Whether these insects serve as food for the plant, or are merely hindered from climbing to the flowers has been questioned. Mr. Darwin asserts that they are actually digested, and Dr. Kerner says he can confirm this from his own observations; but, on the other hand, he tells us that the diatomaceæ are not even killed, nay, that probably the viscid secretions of the plants may be food for them.

Dr. Kerner's introductory chapter is a very fair one: he confesses how weak are the foundations on which the theory of "the preservation of advantageous varieties" at present rests. Observations have been too often most inexact, and observers have unconsciously shaped facts to suit their own views. He looks forward, however, to a time when the functional significance of the position and form of all the normal parts of plants will be really determined; for he holds that "the positive direction and shape of the leaf is of just as great significance for the preservation of a species as the form, colour, and smell of the flower; and that no hair is meaningless, whether found on the cotyledon, or the leaf, or the stem, or the blossom." He does not hold, however, that "structures which, owing to external conditions, have become useless, or even prejudicial to a plant, thereupon undergo gradual degradation or abortion." Individuals in whom a disadvantageous peculiarity happens to present itself succumb, fail to reproduce their like—that is his view. (Note, p. 141.)

As we said, there is nothing in the whole work inconsistent with the idea of creation as opposed to adaptation; while the care and patience with which the observations have been made deserves all praise.

ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS.

English Men of Letters. "Cowper," by Goldwin Smith.
London: Macmillan and Co.

IN several notices which have appeared of Professor Smith's *Cowper*, it has been described as inadequate, as it seems to us without sufficient reason. The balance between the literary and biographical elements is duly preserved. The judgments pronounced seem to us on the whole just. The only deficiencies are in respect of matters which, perhaps, could not be supplied. For example, we have no account of the course of reading and study by which Cowper's style was formed and his mind fed. Study must have formed a chief employment of his leisurely life. Considering the gentleness, not to say feminine cast, of Cowper's character, we have always been surprised at the vigorous strain of his works. Perhaps the only way of explaining this feature is the convenient one of referring it to inborn genius. While there is so much sentiment in Cowper's poems, there is no sentimentality. His strong, native common sense preserved him from this.

Mr. Smith clearly shows that Cowper's tendency to madness was constitutional. Of course, when he became religious, it took a religious form, but religious in its origin it was not. The first occasion was in his irreligious days, at the time of his nomination to a clerkship in the House of Lords. "In the lines which record

the sources of his despondency there is not a touch of religious despair, or of anything connected with religion. The catastrophe was brought on by an incident with which religion had nothing to do." In reality religion was the means of his deliverance from the first attack. At the same time we are free to confess that subsequently the happiest means were not always used for warding off attacks. Spiritual remedies were applied to an essentially physical malady; a mistake which is made only too often. Thus we read of Newton and Cowper and Mrs. Unwin spending the whole day "in a round of religious exercises, without relaxation or relief. On fine summer evenings, instead of a walk there was a prayer meeting. Cowper himself was made to do violence to his intense shyness by leading in prayer."

On the whole, Cowper's was a happy life. The clouds were only occasional save at the end, when they settled down never to lift again. The story of his own and Mrs. Unwin's decay is very pathetic. With these exceptions, his genial temperament found ample scope for indulgence in the society of the Newtons, Lady Austen, Lady Hesketh, even the Catholic Throckmortons, and above all, of Mrs. Unwin, who, after her husband's death, became Cowper's inseparable companion and friend. The only reason given for their not entering into the nearer relation, which naturally suggests itself, is the possible recurrence of Cowper's malady.

One tribute to Cowper's poetical genius is too good to be omitted. "The clerk of All Saints', Northampton, came over to ask him to write the verses annually appended to the bill of mortality for that parish. Cowper suggested that 'there were several men of genius in Northampton, particularly Mr. Cox, the statuary, who, as everybody knew, was a first-rate maker of verses.' 'Alas!' replied the clerk, 'I have heretofore borrowed help from him, but he is a gentleman of so much reading that the people of our town cannot understand him.' The compliment was irresistible, and for seven years the author of *The Task* wrote the mortuary verses for All Saints', Northampton."

END OF VOL. LIV.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME LIV.

- A] Liberal-Conservative Chinaman on Western Countries, 386; geography, 387; Great Britain, 389; Russia and China, 391; France, 393; religions of Europe, 395; notions of China, 397; Christianity, 399; Western science, 401; Roman Catholic teaching, 405; ancient Greeks, 405; steam and machinery, 407; intercourse with foreign nations, 409; opium, 411; the board of punishment, 413; foreign doctrine, 415; orthodoxy and heresy, 417; genuine results to be prized, 419; results of the Symposium, 421.
- Ancient Classics for English Readers —Lucretius, 518.
- 'Annales Cambriae,' 359.
- 'Annales de l'Observatoire de Paris,' 26.
- 'Anti-theistic Theories,' Flint's, 1.
- Approaching Perihelia of the Larger Planets, 26; gloomy prognostications, 27; difference between civil and solar year, 29; changes in longitudes of perihelia, 31; the eccentricity of their orbits, 33; ultra-millennarianism and astrology, 35; the mass of the sun and planets, 37; magnetic influence of the moon, 39; sunspots and the earth's magnetism, 41; the cause of sunspots, 43; relative distances of the larger planets, 45; perihelia and pestilence, 47; perihelia during the Christian era, 49; the epidemics of the present century, 51; conclusion, 53.
- Authorship of Nature, The, 1; Agnosticism, 3; the Theistic inference, 5; no certainty in Atheism, 7; Bruno and Spinoza, 9; causation, 11; defects of materialism, 13; the supernatural in nature, 15; final causes, 17; coincident cause, 19; organs and tissues, 21; the two methods, 23; results of the inquiry, 25.
- 'Basis of Faith, The,' Conder's, 1.
- 'Bible Record of Creation,' Grant's, 490.
- Bishop Wilberforce, 331; his personal qualities, 333; his father's letters, 335; takes holy orders—the living at Brighthelm, 337; parish troubles, 339; the Oxford movement, 341; the Hampden controversy, 343; his wife's death, 345; his opinion of the Oxford tracts, 347; his opposition to the theology of the tracts, 349; correspondence with Dr. Pusey, 351; his consecration as Bishop of Oxford, 353; descriptive letters, 355; the Bishop and Dr. Hampden, 357.
- 'Blue Books of the Cape Colony,' 74.
- 'Book of Revelation,' Gregory's, 222.
- Chambers's 'Cyclopaedia,' 26.
- 'Chapters of Early English Church History,' Bright's, 359.
- 'Compendium of South African History and Geography,' Theal's, 74.

- 'Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism,' Uhlhorn's, 422.
- 'Contemporary Portraits,' Pressensé's, 214.
- 'Conversations,' Senior's (1871, 1878, 1880), 265.
- 'Critique of Practical Reason,' Kant's, 223.
- 'Cyprus in 1879,' Baker's, 247.
- 'Divine Footprints,' Griffiths's, 219.
- 'Dr. Duff, Life of,' Smith's, 93.
- 'Dr. Moulton on the Hebrews,' 446; characteristics of this commentary, 447; Dr. Moulton, 449; "Paul-like," 451; Apollos, 453; "the firstborn," 455; apart from sin, 457; the temptation, 459; Delitzsch, 461; the atonement, 463; the Eternal Spirit, 465; quickened in the spirit, 467; Mr. Mason on St. Peter, 469; the definition of faith, 471; suggestions, 473; conclusion, 475.
- Early Victory of Christianity, 422; state of the heathen world, 423; religion and the State, 425; life in ancient Rome, 427; extravagance and vice, 429; first stage of persecution, 431; second stage, 433; Aurelius a persecutor, 435; the lowest depths, 437; third stage, 439; last persecution, 441; final victory, 443; conclusion, 445.
- Ecce Christianus, 212.
- 'Economics of Industry,' Marshall's, 243.
- Encyclopædia Britannica, 26.
- English Men of Letters: Southey, 235; ditto—Milton, 235; ditto—Cowper, 527.
- 'Essays,' Hume's, 1.
- 'Final Causes,' Janet's, 1.
- 'Flowers and their Unbidden Guests,' Kerner's, 525.
- Foreign Classics for English Readers: Montaigne, 258; ditto—Calderon, 258; ditto—Goethe, 516; ditto—Petrarch, 516.
- 'Fossil Men,' Dawson's, 471.
- 'France under the First Empire,' Macdonnell's, 256.
- 'Gerard's Monument,' &c., Pfeiffer's, 225.
- German Preachers and Preaching of the Present Century, 303; Schleiermacher, 305; ditto, 307; Claus Harms, 309; Hofacker, 311; ditto, 313; Nitzsch, 315; Tholuck, 317; Löhe and Beck, 319; Menken, 321; Ludwig Harms, 323; Brückner and Uhlhorn, 325; Koegel, 327; ditto, 329.
- 'Gipsy Life,' Smith's, 505.
- 'Handbook of Methodism,' Woolmer's, 222.
- 'Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis, 359.'
- 'Historical Essays,' Freeman's, 249.
- 'Historical Memorials of Canterbury,' Stanley's, 359.
- 'Homiletical and Pastoral Lectures,' Ellicott's, 483.
- 'Homilies on Christian Work,' Stanford's, 216.
- 'Imperial Blue-Books relating to South Africa,' 74.
- 'Indian Finance,' Fawcett's, 264.
- 'Introduction to Zoology,' Huxley's, 514.
- Is Life Worth Living? 154; the grounds of pessimism, 155; superficial explanations of the problem, 157; the reality of evil, 159; the indictment of life, 161; science and despair, 163; the cruelty of nature, 165; the rejection of art, 167; morals the test of value, 169; the genesis of morality, 171; morality and the creeds, 173; interdependence of religion and morality, 175; the secret of life, 177; the dark past, 179; the uncertain future, 181; the rejection of immortality, 183; the issue of pessimism, 185.
- 'John Milton, Life of,' Vol. VI., Masson's, 508.
- 'Journals kept in Ireland, 1846-7,' Senior's, 265.
- Kafirland: the Native Policy of the Cape Colony, 74; John Dunn, 75; the future, 77; over-population, 79; colonial government, 81; Sir Bartle Frere's memorandum, 83; the Basutoes, 85; Griqualand East, 87; industrial schools, 89; white and black races, 91.
- 'La Bible au Seizième Siècle,' Berger's, 186.

- 'Letters of C. Kingsley,' Kingsley's, 262.
- 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' Hook's, 359.
- 'M. Berger on the Bible in the Sixteenth Century,' 186; the Bible in the middle ages, 187; early helps, 189; Erasmus, 191; the judgments of Erasmus, 193; Ximenes and Erasmus, 195; the Complutensian Polyglot, 197; principles, 199; Scripture the touchstone, 201; Carlstadt and Luther, 203; Luther and St. James, 205; Calvin, 207; the Holy Spirit, 209; conclusion, 211.
- 'Manliness of Christianity,' Hughes's, 220.
- 'Metaphysics of the School,' Harper's, 487.
- 'Method, The, &c., of Descartes,' 223.
- 'Migration from China,' Palmer's, 260.
- Mind and Brain, 124; cells and fibres, 125; their mysterious connection, 127; psychology precedes physiology, 129; Dr. Ferrier's experiments, 131; sensory centres, 133; possibility of localising a centre for self-consciousness, 135; sensitiveness of the grey matter, 137; significance of cortical insensibility to pain, 139; cortical centres employed in language, 141; aphasia of Lordat, 143; retentive capacity of the brain, 145; voluntary inhibition, 147; mental action of physical fatigue, 149; dreaming, 151; a field for future discoveries, 153.
- 'Modern Atheism,' Jenkins's, 1.
- 'National Cyclopadia, The,' 26.
- 'Necessary Existence of God,' Gillespie's, 1.
- 'New Poems,' Gosse's, 511.
- 'New Testament Commentary,' Elliott's, 446.
- 'Nile Gleanings,' Stuart's, 498.
- 'Old Testament a Living Book,' Phelps's, 480.
- 'Other Worlds than Ours,' Proctor's, 26.
- 'Our Future Highway,' Cameron's, 231.
- 'Our Rest,' 26.
- 'Oxford,' Lang's, 494.
- 'Pall Mall Gazette,' 26.
- 'Path and Goal,' Kalisch's, 489.
- 'Pauline Theory of Inspiration,' Atwell's, 485.
- 'Poems, selected from P. B. Shelley,' Garnett's, 229.
- 'Poems of Wordsworth,' Arnold's, 229.
- 'Poetical Works of Robert Burns,' Smith's, 229.
- 'Reasons of Unbelief,' Drew's, 221.
- 'Relations of Mind and Brain, 124.
- 'Religions of China,' Legge's, 476.
- Religious Liberty in Europe, 54; ancient English spirit of liberty, 55; Holland, Belgium, and France, 57; Italy, 59; Spain and Portugal, 61; Germany and Austria, 63; religious liberty in Austria, 65; action of the Evangelical Alliance, 67; Bavaria in contrast with Baden and Wurtemberg, 69; stages of progress, 71; State and Church in Germany, 73.
- Senior's Conversations, 265; Thiers' character, 267; Thiers on the glories of France, 269; Guizot, 271; a Frenchman on England's mission, 273; the power of the "Garde," 275; the Emperor a coward, 277; Madame Cornu's anecdotes, 279; the Emperor's hatred of business, 281; Prince Napoleon's views, 283; Montalembert on Lacordaire, 285; Poland, 287; Federals and South-erners, 289; The Mexican War, 291; French servants and children, 293; the Campana case, 295; Renan on "The Song," 297; journals in Ireland, 299; Relief works, 301.
- 'Six days of Creation,' Lewis's, 217.
- 'Songs and Sonnets of Shakespeare,' Palgrave's, 229.
- St. Augustine of Canterbury, 359; preparation for Christianity, 361; Queen Bertha, 363; the landing place, 365; interview at Ebbe's Fleet, 367; Baptism of Ethelbert, 369; Gregory the Great, 371; Gregory's letters, 373; scheme of Church organisation, 375; treatment of heathen customs, 377; Austcliffe, 379; British ritual and use, 381; the second interview, 383; results of the mission, 385.
- 'Strange Tales from a Chinese Studio,' Giles's, 501.

- 'Theism,' Flint's, 1.
 'Truce of God,' &c., Stevens's, 224.
 'Twenty Years in the Wild West,'
 Houstoun's, 240.
 Two Indian Missionaries, 93; early
 life, 95; Interview with Carey, 97;
 English education in India, 99;
 conversions, 101; Dr. Duff in Scot-
 land, 103; close of Indian career,
 105; Christian officials in India,
 107; Dr. Wilson, 109; public dis-
 cussions, 111; Zoroastrians, 113;
 discussions in court, 115; evangelis-
 tic tours, 117; ditto, 119; Somnath
 gates, 121; close of life, 123.
 'Voice and Public Speaking,' Sand-
 lands's, 254.
 Water Supply, Browne's, 523.
 'Wilberforce, Samuel, Life of,' Ash-
 well's, 331.
 'Wilson, John, Life of,' Smith's, 93.
 Woman's Work and Worth, 252.
 'Ying Hai Lun; or, Echoes from the
 Far Seas,' 386.
 'Zur Geschichte der Predigt,' Nebe's,
 303.

